EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FLORENCE
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

E U I W O R K I N G P A P E R No. 104

*Sociology in Germany and Austria 1918-1945.

The Emigration of the Social Sciences and its Consequences.

The Development of Sociology in Germany after the Second World War, 1945-1967.

M. Rainer Lepsius

* These three articles were originally published in German by Westdeutscher Verlag GmbH, Wiesbaden, to whom we wish to express our gratitude for allowing the EUI to publish them in English in our Working Paper Series.

Our thanks also go to Iain Fraser for the English translations.

BADIA FIESOLANA, SAN DOMENICO (FI).

Printed in Italy in May, 1984
European University Institute
Badia Fiesolana
I - 50016 San Domenico (FI)
Italy

SOCIOLOGY IN GERMANY AND AUSTRIA, 1918-1945.

Historical Material on Development, Emigration and Influence.

Edited by M. Rainer Lepsius.

Introduction

The Sociology of the Inter-war Period: Trends in Development and Criteria for Evaluation. By M. Rainer Lepsius.

Interest in the history of the social sciences in Germany and Austria has grown in recent years, especially for sociology between the end of the First World War and the new beginning after 1945[1]. This period, fruitful in its results and many-sided in its academic history, for long met with only slight attention, and even today comprehensive, systematic presentations are still lacking[2]. In view of the sharp political breaks within the period, the complexity of the contemporary culture and the multiplicity of academic approaches, and the close interpenetration of academic developments, cultural and ideological history and political events, the period presents special difficulties for comprehensive and systematic analysis. Even this volume can make only a selective contribution, by publishing material on the development, emigration and influence of the sociologists. Its selection of themes has been made so as to take existing studies into account, and is intended to complement them. Not all the articles planned could be produced; but in any case the bulk reached made limitations necessary. In particular, among the sociological centres important in the twenties, Cologne, Frankfurt and Heidelberg have not been

given adequate treatment. Among the historically influential currents Leopold von Wiese's theory of relations, the formation of the "Frankfurt School", Alfred Weber's historical and cultural sociology, the relations between sociology and political science, the development of the theory of science and its influence on sociology and social psychology have been neglected. Among the intellectual biographies, only people for whom descriptions are not already available elsewhere have been dealt with[3]. The volume therefore does not claim to replace comprehensive description that is lacking, but to complement available works and present a set of problems thematically without developing it through specific studies of individuals, currents of thought and trends in development.

I

The history of sociology in German-speaking central Europe between 1918 and 1945 is demarcated by epoch-making political events: the First World War and the Russian Revolution on one side, the Second World War and the overthrow of National Socialism on the other. These events define a unique period, the political and cultural importance of which is quite out of proportion to its shortness. In these thirty years or so, German-speaking central Europe as it had developed until the First World War first had its area of influence restricted by the dissolution of the old Hapsburg empire, was then gradually overgrown by authoritarian regimes, had its cultural substance weakened by National Socialism and was finally broken up by the division of Europe after the Second World War. The destruction of this "Mitteleuropa" as the area of a multi-faceted culture mediated through the German language is bound up with the annihilation of Central European Jewry, whence great intellectual impulses had proceeded,

in the social sciences in particular[4].

Confining the history of sociology in this period to the nation state of the German Reich would be particularly out of line with the facts and misleading in results. Germany and Austria must be seen in a context given by the multiplicity of intellectual milieus that defined the period, and by exchanges among these milieus. The neglect of Vienna in attempts to understand the cultural history of the German Reich has for long been an evil that has led to a seriously one-sided approach and a narrow selection of the impulses and the varieties of German language culture[5]. The further exclusion of Prague and Budapest the two other cultural centres of the Hapsburg monarchy, narrows the perspective yet more. What can be seen from a contemporary viewpoint, namely, the far-reaching break-up of Mitteleuropa as a German-speaking cultural area, does not yet apply to the inter-war period.

The close interpenetration of intellectual currents in Germany and in Austria in the area of the social sciences can be seen from the great controversies before the First World War, the methodological dispute between Gustav Schmoller and Carl Menger and the debates between Max Weber and Rudolf Goldscheid within the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie, as well as in the contempory exchange of scholars. For the inter-war period we shall mention only Joseph Schumpeter, Emil Lederer and Karl Mannheim, as well as Carl Grünberg, the first director of the Frankfurt Institut für Sozialforschung. Karl Mannheim, and like him Georg Lukács and Arnold Hauser, thought of themselves as Hungarians, published in German and had studied in Berlin and Heidelberg. These things make it clear that the history of "German" sociology cannot be limited to a nation state[6].

The academic history of sociology in the inter-war years is

divided by the National Socialist seizure of power into two periods, with the second period further split between sociology under National Socialism and sociology in emigration. In this period we therefore have to deal with three political constellations within which German-language sociology develops. Sociology in emigration cannot be left out of consideration of the history of German sociology in this period; this is not justifiable for several reasons. Firstly, sociology in emigration was the bearer of central intellectual traditions which under the rule of National Socialism in Germany, and following the imposition of the corporate state in Austria were politically persecuted or suppressed, especially the tradition, developing out of Marxism, of the macro-sociological structural analysis of industrial society. Secondly, the majority of the representatives of the newer approaches developed after the First World War, with the impact of Freud on the social sciences, phenomenological sociology, the sociology of knowledge and modern political sociology, were among the émigrés. For emigration meant not only the mainly forced departure of social scientists, but also the exclusion of specific lines of tradition, approaches and research objects. Thirdly, sociology in emigration affected the refoundation of sociology after the war in the Federal Republic and in Austria. This is most evident in the case of the Frankfurt school, which only in emigration took on the form that was to enable it after the war to exercise its influence. It is also true of the refoundation of a sociological political science, or political sociology. A view confined to the territory of the German Reich, and for the post-1933 phase dealing only with sociology under National Socialism, is inappropriate to the facts and misleading in result. Sociology under National Socialism in fact

no longer represents the whole academic development of German-language sociology in the twenties; it is already a one-sidedly selected sociology. Additionally, a number of sociologists who stayed in Germany did not (after 1933), whether from constraint or voluntarily, publish any more sociological works, their chances of effect being lost under National Socialism. This is the case with both Alfred Weber and Alfred von Martin. The state of sociology under National Socialism is defined precisely by the fact that characteristic positions of German sociology could no longer be presented, and could find their representation and continuation only via emigration. Leaving the emigration out of account therefore leads to completely one-sided constructions of the so-called continuity of sociology after 1933.

The sociology of the inter-war period can be divided into three very different political and cultural constellations, each of them short. First comes sociology between the end of the war and 1933 in Germany or 1934 in Austria, a period of some fifteen years. Second is sociology under National Socialism, covering some ten years, with increasing restrictions on academic work in the war years. Thirdly there is sociology in emigration, which continues as a separate variety from 1933 right into the fifties. The development is therefore highly fragmented. There was never a "zero hour"; and there are therefore also continuities between these periods, though the "scientific form" (Wissenschaftsgestalt) of sociology - to use an expression of Karl Mannheim's - was in each case different. Moreover, even within the periods sociology did not have a uniform character. Neither the sociology of the Weimar Republic nor that of the emigration nor that of National Socialism were homogeneous in academic basis, conception of the scientific character of sociology, lines

of enquiry or "paradigms". This means that there is a considerable complexity of manifestations of sociology in the period. In such a complex situation, trends of development and criteria for evaluation are hard to determine. They can be sketched out below only provisionally and summarily.

II.

At the beginning of the development of sociology in the Weimar Republic stands the death in 1920 of Max Weber. He had only just taken up a Chair again in Munich, and it may probably be assumed that he would have acquired considerable influence. His death meant a definite weakening of the sociological paradigma (Erkenntnisprogramm) that he had devised. To be sure, Marianne Weber was able in a few years, by 1924, to publish almost the whole works left posthumously or in collective volumes in new, comprehensive form, and in 1926 to transmit her husband's heritage to posterity with her impressive biography, but there was no circle of disciples that could rapidly receive and develop the work. By contrast with Emile Durkheim, Weber had no "school"; his scholarly reception was therefore slow and unsystematic. The programme pursued by Weber of a sociology founded upon methodological individualism and a comparative analysis of social structure and cultural system was not able to stamp developments in the twenties[7]. His death meant a decisive weakening in the front against holism and historicism at precisely the time when materialistic, Social-Darwinist and idealist philosophies of history were being activated to interpret the cultural shock of the lost war.

Georg Simmel, who died shortly before the war ended in 1918,

likewise met with practically no response in the twenties. Along with Weber, he was among those who wished to base sociology upon bahavioural theory and to dispel the idea of entities deduced from the philosophy of history. Like Weber, Simmel too was taken up only after the Second World War.

Of the old guard of founders of sociology before the First World War, those who worked on into the Weimar period were Ferdinand Tönnies, Werner Sombart and Alfred Weber. None of them offered a clear and comprehensive research programme for sociology that might have developed a shaping power. While Tönnies was throughout the twenties the recognized Nestor of sociology, and also chairman of the German Sociological Association the personal regard he was held in cannot be confused with his actual influence.
After the war, the Marxist tradition for the first time gained entry to the universities, but after the experiences of the Bolshevik Revolution it had been robbed of its optimism. Even scholars whose attitudes inclined towards socialism initially developed no research programme that was sociological in a strict sense. The discovery of Marx's early writings and the work of Karl Korsch, Landshut, Horkheimer, Marcuse and others enlivened the Marxist tradition in sociology only at the end of the Weimar Republic, only for it to be immediately tabooed after 1933.

In the twenties there was no dominating figure in sociology, which developed in a number of circles with absolutely no uniformity. Even within the local centres of sociology in the Weimar Republic there was hardly any paradigmatic unity.

This was true of Berlin just as much as for Vienna[8]. But even the more compact centres such as Heidelberg, Frankfurt, Cologne and Leipzig were not academically homogeneous. In Frankfurt, until 1930, sociology was represented by Oppenheimer and by Carl Grünberg's Institut für Sozialforschung; sociology did not win importance for the history of sociology until 1930 when Karl Mannheim and Max Horkheimer received Chairs. Both had their own set of pupils, with practically no overlap. In Cologne, beside the relationship theory of Leopold von Wiese there developed quite different trends, like those represented by Max Scheler, Helmuth Plessner and Paul Honigsheim. Not even in Leipzig, where Hans Freyer had great personal influence, can one speak of a school in the strict sense[9]. Heidelberg is just as diversified. Besides Alfred Weber, Emil Lederer worked there, both at a distance from the heritage of Max Weber. The younger Edgar Salin, Arnold Bergstraesser and Karl Mannheim had little inter-relations. Outside these local centres a few sociologists worked in small circles, such as Ferdinand Tönnies in Kiel, Andreas Walther in Göttingen and later in Hamburg, Johann Plenge in Münster, Max Graf zu Solms in Marburg; none of them, with the exception of Tönnies, of any general influence.

In the early Weimar Republic sociology had no clear self-conception, and few saw it as an empirically based separate science. The prevailing idea was that of a vague "sociological perspective" which should permeate and complement the existing sciences. Academic sociologists followed training and careers within the existing disciplines, particularly in economics, history and philosophy.

In connection with the post-war debate on university reform, this

largely unclarified self-perception of sociology played a central role. C.H. Becker, orientalist and Minister for education and cultural affairs in Prussia began the debate in 1919 with the call to overcome the specialization of knowledge and teaching in the traditional disciplines by the insertion of new, synthesizing studies. He demanded this task particularly of sociology, "since it consists solely of synthesis. That makes it all the more important for us as a means of education. Chairs of sociology are an urgent necessity for all universities. By that is meant sociology in the broadest sense of the word, including political science and contemporary history. It is only by sociological observation that in the intellectual sphere the mental habit can be created which then becomes, when transferred to the ethical sphere, political conviction"[10]. These formulations already contain all the elements of the contemporary understanding of sociology: its inter-disciplinary, synthetic character, its task of ethical and political education, its significance for the founding and spreading of a new political culture.

Against the establishment of professorships of sociology, advocated by C.H. Becker as a measure of university reform there immediately spoke out the historian Georg von Below, who regarded a synthesizing "universal science" as utter dilettantism. Instead, the quite justified sociological lines of enquiry could best be pursued within the existing subject specialties, especially since "every sociologist must always belong to one of the traditional disciplines, if he is not to lose firm ground from under his feet"[11].

In this position too the contemporary understanding of sociology is well expressed; a "general sociology" has no specific object

of knowledge and cannot be pursued scientifically outside the existing disciplines; the attempt to do so turns, in Alfred Dove's famous phrase, into a mere "rental agency for verbal masks", or into political education.

Ferdinand Tönnies, the president of the German Sociological Association, reacted to these ideas with ambivalence. On the one hand he agreed with Becker's proposal to set up professorships in sociology, "because the academic philosophers as a rule are aloof from sociology and have no understanding for it"; on the other he saw sociology, within which he also counted political science, as a part of philosophy, leaving the question of the definition of sociology in a broader or narrower sense open: "as long as thinking and working go on, imaginative thinking and methodical work, that is what sociology needs, like any other field, whether it is understood in a broader or narrower sense"[12]. This position too is typical for the subsequent evolution: the institutionalization of sociology advocated and promoted by the professional sociologists is not accompanied by any clear self-conception as regards sociology, lines of inquiry, methods and function.

The situation of sociology in the early twenties can be portrayed as a "circle of misunderstandings" with great consequences. The sociologists' ambivalent self-perception led to a vagueness in others' perceptions regarding the scientific character of sociology. It was expected to fulfill pedagogical, political and moral tasks that were rejected by the established sciences. Sociology, anxious for recognition and institutionalization, acknowledged these expectations from outside, reinforcing the ambivalence of its self-perception. This "circle of misunderstandings" is perhaps typical for the institutionalization of new sciences, since funding is decided

by political bodies led not by an academic interest in knowledge, but by ideas of the desirable educational and vocational function of universities. The discrepancy between self-perception and perception by others is therefore significant for all institutionalization processes. In the case of sociology, which neither had a uniform self-perception nor was adequately institutionalized, this gap was not bridged in the inter-war period[13]. A large proportion of the sociologists accepted elements of others' perceptions and saw sociology as characterized only by a largely undefined "sociological perspective", which had to serve the realization of moral and political objectives.

What was still thought of by C.H. Becker at the beginning of the Weimar Republic as a reinforcement for a democratic political culture - sociology as political education - was taken up at the end of the Weimar Republic by Hans Freyer for a quite different political culture [14]. For Becker, as for Freyer, sociology is a synthesis of knowledge made to interpret a (politically diversely conceived) image of the present a commitment and an experience. The "battle for sociology" (C.H. Becker) waged in public was in fact a fight for the imposition of different "political cultures" through a politicized and pedagogically instrumentalized university. This fight has in itself nothing to do with sociology, and only used the name because it was available and not pre-empted by any clear self-perception by sociologists. This is a clear reflection of the fact that Max Weber's attempt to develop sociology as an empirical science built upon methodological individualism[15] had not gained any dominant influence for sociologists' self-conception in

the Weimar period. Holistic, historicist, idealist and voluntarist ideas determined sociology's self-perception and perception by others much more strongly[16]. Becker's statement that "the fight for sociology is at bottom the fight for the new concept of science" [17] is spot on: it should not however by understood as if this were a specific problem of sociology. It is a general fight about the definition of the function of the sciences in a period of heterogeneous political ideas and values, which affect sociology just as much as other sciences, though more explicitly argued out in it than in them.

The first Chairs of sociology were set up after the war in the newly founded universities: in Frankfurt by special endowments, in Cologne by municipal initiative (the Forschungsinstitut für Sozialwissenschaften). The third new university, Hamburg, also received a sociological Chair, as did Leipzig (in the tradition of Lamprecht's sythesizing cultural history), as well as some technical colleges, such as Dresden, with the idea of enriching the education of engineers through the humanities. The Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie took up the problem of the institutionalization of sociology only in 1924, asking Hans Lorenz Stoltenberg, who had just taken his habilitation in Giessen, to draw up a memorandum[18]. At the general assembly in Vienna on 29 September 1926 resolutions were put forward calling for the admission of sociology as an independent examination subject with equal rights[19]. This was seen as all the more urgent because in the meantime economics, made independent through the final examination for the diploma in economics, had become a closed course of studies in which sociology could appear only as a subsidiary or additional subject. The German Sociological Association was anxious to make it possible for its own students to do major subject studies, and at the same time offered itself (especially for technical and commercial colleges)

as a supplementary subject in General Studies. Again in the institutionalization policy pursued by the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie we find the combination of sociology in the "narrow" and in the "broad" sense, which left room for all conceptions. Ferdinand Tönnies added a postscript to Stoltenberg's memorandum, opining that only the further development of sociology could justify its present institutionalization. Throw it in at the deep end and it would learn to swim[20].

This discussion was pursued in 1932 more clearly and unambiguously. Karl Mannheim gave a speech at the congress of university teachers of sociology of the German Reich on 28 February 1932, which became decisive in motivating that body[21]. Even by itself the differentiation of this body of professional sociologists within the DGS, the members of which were in the main university teachers of other disciplines who had sociological interests, especially economists, shows the new trend towards a firmer self-conception. Mannheim's speech, which was separately published[22], reflects the younger specialized sociologists' new self-perception much more clearly than the debates of the sociological congresses. Mannheim defines sociology in the "narrower sense" as a "special science" which studies the "conditions and forms of social processes" in an "unhistorical, axiomatic", "comparative and typifying" and "historically individualizing" way. He adds the warning: "in Germany we must today primarily oppose the exaggerations of the historicists, who still under the influence of the traditions of the romantic and the historical school, make the theory of the essential uniqueness of the historical into a myth, thereby closing themselves off from all those fruitful insights that comparison and generalization would be capable of bringing out". He distances himself from all philosophers of history, and also from cultural sociology as a "doctrine of the overall connectedness of social and intellectual life".

The connections between different areas of culture arise not "because they are parts of some spirit floating free somewhere, but because they are an expression of the life and fate of quite definite human groups". For him, sociology also includes empirical social research. "The structural outlook contains the danger that one may become accustomed to accepting facts observed in the mass as exact data or else combining them with each other as purely hypothetical approaches. This leads to one hypothesis being supported on another, and to building card houses that do not correspond to any reality. As a counterweight to the runaway growth of purely constructive thinking, acquisition of the method of exact description, application of numerical results, and quantitative procedures are very desirable. Finally, he enumerates among sociology's areas of work "the study of contemporary affairs" as "structural sociology" of the present, in which he also sees the path towards the "sociological orientation" of a democratic society, lest from "rational democracy" an "emotional democracy" emerge as the basic legitimation of a dictatorship.

From this comprehensive programme Mannheim develops three different curricula for the teaching of sociology, with a political and legal, an economic and social science, and a philosophical, intellectual history emphasis. He does this cautiously, aware that "the initial configuration of a science marks its later form, and especially, that the form of teaching tends to influence the form of the science". Once codified, the "conceptualization will long continue to decide what is at all capable of entering these sciences from empirical experience, and what is inescapably concealed by these very concepts"[23].

Karl Mannheim's ideas have been set out at such length here because

they typify the self-conception of sociology that had been reached at the end of the Weimar republic. Mannheim is a typical representative of the younger sociologists of the Weimar period, who saw in sociology a specific discipline not just a perspective and had gained a great reputation with his book "Ideology and Utopia" (1929). Had this development promoted by him not been broken off in 1933, he would probably in the thirties have had an imprinting effect with his ideas on more than just the institutionalization process.

Among the sociologists of influence in the Weimar period who had not already emerged before the First World War, the most important are Leopold von Wiese, Hans Freyer and Karl Mannheim. Leopold von Wiese, though a tireless organizer, lacked intellectual fascination; Hans Freyer was a brilliant intellectual, but took no part in the institutional development of the discipline; Karl Mannheim combined analytic precision with a sense of responsibility for the scientific development and political and educational function of sociology in a liberal and democratic society. He could have brought Max Weber's impulse further in a typologically comparative, anti-historicist and non-idealist sociology.

All the efforts at institutionalizing sociology had no further success. To be sure, the Prussian parliament decided in 1929 to set up Chairs of Sociology at all universities, but first the economic crisis and then National Socialism put an end to these endeavours.

III

Decisive impulses for the development of sociology in the Weimar

Republic came not from the universities and from academic sociology, but from quite other contexts and practical orientations. Of particular importance was the popular education movement that took root after the war, in all its forms. Most important was the Deutsche Hochschule für Politik in Berlin, founded in 1920, which became a centre for political sociology and political science[24].

Equally innovative and influential was the "Schule der Arbeit" in Frankfurt[25], of which Hugo Sinzheimer was a co-founder. The Volkshochschule movement met with great interest among the younger sociologists and offered many of them their first professional platform. Thus, Paul Honigsheim was director of the Cologne Volkshochschule from 1919 to 1933, and Theodor Geiger worked in the administration of the Berlin Volkshochschule until he was called to the Brunswick technical university in 1928.

The expansion of the vocational institutes offered the younger sociologists new fields of activity, as did the schools for social and welfare work. This whole branch of non-university education has not yet been investigated for its importance in the development of sociology in the twenties; nor has the adult education activity of the parties, trade unions and various youth movement groups[26].

Also important was the development of labour law and labour courts. Labour law opened up a new field for a sociological treatment of the law. Hugo Sinzheimer is an influential example of this. Trade union and employer association staffs brought lawyers into contact with the social sciences, such as Ernst Fraenkel and Franz

Neumann.

The more traditionalist the universities became and the more anti-democratic ideas permeated their staffs[27], the more the younger social scientists turned towards fields of activity outside the universities. "What we call social and political science was as a general rule done outside university walls", wrote Franz Neumann in retrospect[28]. In this connection one may also mention the journal "Die Gesellschaft", and "Die Arbeit", organ of the socialist clerical workers' association, which provided a forum for these pedagogically and politically orientated interests of the younger social scientists.

After 1928 there was an astonishing invigoration of sociology, in both its academic and non-university manifestations. This has not yet been clearly brought out in available descriptions of the development of sociology in the Weimar Republic. Such important books appeared as "Ideology and Utopia" by Karl Mannheim in 1929, "Soziologie als Wirklichkeitswissenschaft" by Hans Freyer (1930) and the "Handbook of Sociology" edited by Alfred Vierkandt (1931), which constitutes the first attempt at a systematic presentation of sociological analysis, and had a central theoretical article, "Sociology: Tasks, Methods, Approaches", written by Theodor Geiger. In 1930 in Frankfurt there was a change in the representation of sociology from Oppenheimer to Mannheim and from Grünberg to Horkheimer. Theodor Geiger had already been called to Brunswick, in 1928. The generation of 35-year olds began to occupy the Chairs, redefining sociology and also turning to empirical and practice-orientated work on the social structure of the present. Among this generation are: Theodor Geiger (born 1891), Alfred Salomon (1891), Gottfried Salomon (1892), Karl Mannheim (1893), Max Horkheimer (1895). They stand beside a much older generation of notables in the field:

Ferdinand Tönnies (1855), Werner Sombart (1863), Franz Oppenheimer (1864), Alfred Vierkandt (1867), Alfred Weber (1868), Richard Thurnwald (1869). There was a generation gap of almost thirty years; a generation moulded by Bismarck's empire was replaced by one marked by the World War and the post-war period. Leopold von Wiese (1876) is close to the older generation; Hans Freyer (1887) to the younger. The new upsurge in sociology after 1928 was borne by the younger generation, and it was precisely they who in the main at the age of about forty had to end their academic work in Germany and emigrate.

One expression of this new orientation, which was a liberation from the old philosophical and methodological positions of "meta-sociological" reflection and saw sociology as a science of the present, was the publication series "Soziologische Gegenwartsfragen" founded in 1931 and edited by Alfred von Martin, Sigmund Neumann and Albert Salomon. Only the first volume actually came out; Theodor Geiger, The Social Stratification of the German People (1932). The programme for this publication series remained uncompleted; the three editors were no longer politically acceptable after 1933 [29].

Nothing indicates that the development of sociology would itself have come to an end at the end of the Weimar Republic. On the contrary, it is precisely in the last years of the Weimar Republic that it shows, in its empirical research output and its institutionalization, a vigorous, broad development [30]. The National Socialist seizure of power was the cause of the breaking off of this development. Only 1 characteristic philosophical and sociological line of development did continue across the gap: philosophical anthropology. It was begun in the early twenties by Max Scheler and Helmuth Plessner and pursued into the forties by Arnold Geblen [31].

IV

There has recently been a debate on the significance of the National Socialist power seizure for the development of sociology in Germany and on the evaluation of the character of sociology under National Socialism, which has typically been very ambivalent in its criteria [32].

It must first of all be pointed out that some two-thirds of the professional teachers of sociology or those who taught it as a sideline had been driven from the universities by 1938 in consequence of the power seizure. Over and above that, the majority of younger sociologists that might have become their academic successors also left the country[33]. The considerable weakening of the personnel potential of sociology that meant can be attributed directly to the National Socialist power seizure. Not that it was the intention of National Socialism to persecute especially sociologists, but racially and politically discriminated groups; but this hit the social sciences particularly hard. Hardly a coincidence, since the social sciences pursued programmes of cognition that attracted intellectuals from particular socio-cultural circles. If the emigration is considered not in connection with the loss it meant in personnel potential, but for the consequences it had for the scientific character of the sociology left behind in Germany, there is a systematic effect: the exclusion of particular academic traditions from sociology[34]. The political intervention caused a selection of academic orientations, in favour of historicism holism, idealism, voluntarism and social Darwinism, and against analyses of social change, methodological individualism, materialism, structuralism and socialization theory. The positions first

mentioned have a long tradition in the German human sciences, which were moulded by romanticism and idealism; social Darwinism came along later. National Socialism did not originate these orientations, but made possible their breakthrough against the forces that since the end of the 19th century had been forming against these traditions. These traditions were also represented in sociology if the thinkers favoured after 1933 are to be reckoned in the history of sociology in Germany: Herder, Hegel, Möser, Fichte, Riehl, Dilthey, Spann. If, through these lines of tradition, continuity past 1933 can be shown, one should at the same time determine which other lines of tradition show no continuity. If this is not done, the selection of lines of tradition already determines the result of the investigation: the assertion that sociology survived after 1933.

In all studies of the intellectual roots of National Socialism the question arises which elements of a complex intellectual history are to be selected and brought into causal relationship to National Socialism, and how those elements that had no affinity with National Socialism are to be treated. In principle it may be assumed that for all conceivable political regimes in a long, complex intellectual history it will be possible to find some idea that can be brought into plausible affinity with the legitimation claims of a political regime. But this remains trivial as long as the criteria of selection and assignation remain undefined.

The same is true for the treatment of the questions of the con-

tinuity of sociology past 1933 and of the character of sociology under National Socialism. As long as the criteria for selecting out of the complex history of sociology the elements to which continuity is ascribed and which characterize sociology under National Socialism have not been defined, the statement that there was sociology before and after 1933 is trivial. Such purely nominalist argumentation would be unfair to the facts and confusing in its results, since obviously the history of sociology covers diverse research programmes and methodological options. Account must be taken of these differentiations and the resulting different conceptions of science. The debate whether National Socialism brought sociology in Germany to an end or not is, then, a debate over what is to be understood by sociology, or more exactly how many sociologies one wishes to distinguish, and which of them were brought to an end by National Socialism and which not. It is precisely the heterogeneous scientific character of sociology before 1933 that makes it necessary to draw these distinctions.

If the history of sociology is understood as the attempt to subject to systematic analysis those bases of human existence that are rooted in the fact of man being a social animal, then the history of sociology is a process of the cognitive diferentiation of man's perception of the world and of his existence. This programme aims at a step-by-step differentiation of social factors, structures and processes from biological factors on the one hand and from cultural ideas of order on the other. The unit of analysis becomes the action of individuals considered as it is affected by social factors. From the outset

there is considerable resistance to this process in intellectual history of cognitive differentiation. The relativization of traditional perceptions and interpretations of human existence brought by the sociological outlook causes uncertainties. There result efforts to maintain traditional ordering ideas of a transcendental nature and to reconstruct them as philosophies of history that promise adequate complexity reduction and keep the perception and interpretation of the conditions and goal of history constant. This reaction in intellectual history to the sociological program

takes shape particularly in historicism, holism, idealism, materialism, and social Darwinism. All these programme have in common the intention of preventing the sociological perspective from becoming differentiated, or at least warding off the consequences of it that they see as threatening, albeit with differing strategies. Essential entities that develop according to a law of the philosopy of history, i.e. of a cultural construction of and giving of meaning to human existence, keep thought about the social conditions of human existence at a level of abstraction that is not empirically verifiable. The constructs of social order, thought of as differently in each case, incorporate social factors in a way that they are kept from cognitive differentiation. Sociologists and "anti-sociologists" develop side by side though one ought not to expect the "anti-sociologists" to be better "sociologists" even if some of their representatives call themselves sociologists.

Sociology under National Socialism is, then, distinguished by the fact that "anti-sociological" programmes of cognition gain a prominent function in it. In the race theory, the nature and nurture debate is

closed in favour of innateness, thereby excluding the social conditioning factors of human behaviour that can be isolated analytically. In the theory that treats the people (Volk) as a historical subject, a mythical "whole" becomes an object of social reflection which is beyond sociological analysis. In the idea that reality is constituted by action, the structural conditioning of social organization is replaced by a voluntary idealism. In the stress on integration, synthesis, "community", the endeavour to guard against modernization is expressed. In the opposition against the manifestations of this modernization, Capitalism, the industrial society, urbanization and the dissolution of structurally homogeneous communities, pluralist interest formation and the institutionalization of conflict, differentiation of guiding social and moral ideas and new forms of solidarity, sociology under National Socialism shows preference for devaluing or ignoring the industrial society ("anti-capitalism"), validating village and rural socio-culturally homogeneity ("anti-mass society"), the devaluation of conflict institutionalization ("anti-democratism"), the retaining of homogeneous value loyalties ("anti-intellectualism"), the reduction of solidarity to primary forms ("anti-society"). In so far as a specific selection of social factors of human existence is connected with these moral and political attitutes, one can speak of sociology under National Socialism only as one-sided, selective sociology. But even for this judgement, one first requires proof that sociological research was carried on at all, in a narrower sense. The mere circumstance that work was done on social questions and socially relevant facts (for instance, town and country

planning, work conditions, anthropology and population development processes etc.) does not yet prove this. Sociology is not constituted by an object of experience that is specific to it but by objects of cognition that are specific to it.

FOOTNOTES

1. Apart from Raymond Aron's book La sociologie allemande contemporaine 1935 (German : 1953) and the articles by Karl Mannheim, German Sociology, (1918-1933) in Politica No. 1, February 1934, and by Albert Salomon, German Sociology, in Georges Gurvitch and Wilbert E. Moore (Eds.), Twentieth Century Sociology, New York 1945, consideration of sociology in the inter-war years begins with the four articles in the Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Vol.11 No 1, 1959; Gottfried Eisermann, Die deutsche Soziologie im Zeitraum von 1918 bis 1933; Heinz Maus, Bericht über die Soziologie in Deutschland 1933 bis 1945; Svend Riemer, Die Emigration der deutschen Soziologen nach den Vereinigten Staaten; René König, Die Situation der emigrierten deutschen Soziologen in Europa. To this period belong also the review articles by W.E. Muhlmann, Sociology in Germany: Shift in Alignment, in: H.Becker and A. Boskoff (Eds.) Modern Sociological Theory, New York 1957 and by René König, Germany, in: J.S. Roucek (Ed.) Contemporary Sociology, New York 1958; Helmut Schelsky, Ortsbestimmung der deutschen Soziologie, Düsseldorf, Cologne 1959. In the sixties there appeared Kurt Lenk, Das tragische Bewusstsein in der deutschen Soziologie der zwanziger Jahre, Frankfurter Hefte, 18th year, 1963; Helmut Klages, Zum Standort der deutschen Soziologie im ersten Jahrhundertdrittel, Jahrbuch für Sozialwissenschaft, 15th year, 1964; K. Braunreuther, Ökonomie und Gesellschaft in der deutschen bürgerlichen Soziologie, Berlin (East) 1964; Ralf Dahrendorf, Soziologie und Nationalsozialismus, in: Andreas Flitner (Ed.), Deutsches Geistesleben

und Nationalsozialismus, Tübingen 1965; Bernhard Schäfers (Ed.), Soziologie und Sozialismus, Organisation und Propaganda, Abhandlungen zum Lebenswerk von Johann Plenge, Stuttgart 1967. A new interest in detailed studies began at the turn of the seventies with a number of American publications devoted to the importance of the sociolgical emigration: Laura Fermi, Illustrious Immigrants, Chicago 1968; Donald Flemming and Bernard Bailyn (Eds.), The Intellectual Migration, Cambridge 1969 with contributions by Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Theodor W. Adorno, Marie Jahoda, H. Stuart Hughes and Herbert Feigl on the social sciences; H. Stuart Hughes, The Sea Change, New York 1975. In this connection the article by Franz L. Neumann, The Social Sciences, in: The Cultural Migration, Philadelphia 1953 and the book edited by Robert Boyers, The Legacy of the German Refugee Intellectuals, New York 1969 with contributions from Hannah Arendt, T.W. Adorno, H. Marcuse, K. Mannheim and O. Kirchheim, also deserves mention. Martin Jay's The Dialectical Imagination, A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research 1923-1950, Boston 1973 (German:1976) begins an extensive literature on the Institut für Sozialforschung and its leading personalities, of which we shall mention only Helmut Dubiel, Wissenschaftsorganisation und politische Erfarhung, Frankfurt 1978,

Ulrike Migdal, Die Frühgeschichte des Frankfurter Instituts für Sozialforschung, Frankfurt 1981.* Apart from the interest in the Frankfurt school, there was a book by Paul Kluke, Die Stiftungsuniversität Frankfurt am Main, Frankfurt 1971, containing a description of the social sciences and of the Institut für Sozialforschung. Also worthy of mention is the volume by Susanne Petra Schad, Empirical Social Research

* and Michael Wilson, Das Institut für Sozialforschung und seine Faschismusanalysen, Frankfurt 1982.

in Weimar Germany, Den Haag 1972. Most recently a number of studies have appeared as well as doctoral and habilitation theses, partly completed,partly in progress: Heine von Alemann, Leopold von Wiese und das Forschungsinstitut für Sozialwissenschaften in Köln 1919-1934, in: Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie 28th year 1976; Ursula Karger, Deutsche Soziologentage in Perspektive, in: Sociologia Internationalis, 1976; Alfons Söllner, Geschichte und Herrschaft, Studien zur materialistischen Sozialwissenschaft 1929-1942, Frnakfurt 1979; Bärbel Meurer, Vom bildungsbürgerlichen Zeitvertreib zur Fachwissenschaft. Die deutsche Soziologie im Spiegel ihrer Sozialogentage, in: B. Heidtmann und R. Katzenstein (Eds.) Soziologie und Praxis, Köln 1979; Sven Papcke Die deutsche Soziologie zwischen Totalitarismus und Demokratie, in: Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte, Ausgabe von 17. Mai 1980; Waltraut Bergmann et al Soziologie im Faschismus 1933 - 1945, Köln 1981; Erhard Stölting, Akademische Soziologie in der Weimarer Republik (unpublished manuscript 1981); Carsten Klingemann (Zur Geschichte der deutschen Soziologie zwischen 1933 und 1945); Dirk Käsler (Zur Soziologie der frühen deutschen Soziologie 1909-1934); Hans Werner Prahl (Soziologie in Deutschland von 1930-1960); Sven Papcke are also working on studies on sociology in the years between the wars. For Austria cf. Leopold Rosenmayr, Vorgeschichte und Entwicklung der Soziologie in Oesterreich bis 1933, Zeitschrift für Nationalökonomie, 1966 and John Torrance, The Emergence of Sociology in Austria 1885-1935, in: Europäisches Archiv für Soziologie 1976.

2. Among the works that consider the development of sociology in these decades in a broader cultural context are: René König, Zur Soziologie der zwanziger Jahre, in idem, Studien zur Soziologie, Frankfurt 1971; Georg Lukács, Die deutsche Soziologie in der imperialistischen Periode, in idem, Die Zerstörung der Vernunft, Neuwied 1962, Edward Sbils, Geschichte der Soziologie: Tradition, kologie und Institutionalisierung, in: Talcott Parsons et al. Soziologie - Autobiographisch, Stuttgart 1975. The collective volume edited by Wolf Lepenies, Geschic Soziologie, Frankfurt 1981 contains a number of contributions that are informative for this period.

3. It is not possible here to give a survey of the biographical and autobiographical descriptions on or by social scientists of this period. However, we must at least mention Mathias Greffrath (Ed.), Die Zerstörung einer Zufunft, Reinbek 1979; René König, Leben im Widerspruch, München 1980; Leo Lowenthal, Mitmachen wollte ich nie. Ein autobiographisches Gespräch mit Helmut Dubiel, Frankfurt 1980; Wolf Lepenies (Ed.) Geschichte der Soziologie, Frankfurt 1981 (mit Beiträgen von Heberle, Adorno, Lazarsfeld); Hannah Arendt, Was bleibt? Es bleibt die Muttersprache, in: Günther Gaus, Zur Person, München 1964; Karl R. Popper, An Intellectual Autobi London 1976. There are also the biographies in the Rowohlt publishing house's series of autobiographies

: Helmut Gumnior und Rudolf Ringguth, Max Horkheimer, Reinbek 1973; Fritz Raddatz, Georg Lukács, Reinbek 1972; Wilhelm Mader, Max Scheler, Reinbek 1980; Gerhard Wehr,

Paul Tillich, Reinbek 1979. Finally, Alfons Söllner, Franz L. Neumann - Skizzen zu einer intellekuellen und politischen Biographie, in: Franz L. Neumann, Wirtschaft, Staat, Demokratie, Aufsätze 1930-1954, Frankfurt, 1978.

4. On this cf. René König, Die Juden und die Soziologie, in idem, Studien zur Soziologie, Frankfurt 1971. And more generally: Herbert A. Strauss, Jewish Emigration from Germany. Nazi Policies and Jewish Responses (1), Leo Baeck Institute, Year Book XXV, London 1980.

5. For details on this see the article by Reinhold Knoll et al, Der österreichische Beitrag zur Soziologie von der Jahrhundertwende bis 1938, in this volume. Also William M. Jonston, Oesterreichische Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte, as well as the impressive descriptions of the unique Vienna intellectual environment around and after the turn of the century by Carl E. Schorske, Fin -de-siècle Vienna. Politics and Culture, New York 1980; Allan Janik and Stephen Toulmin, Wittgenstein's Vienna, New York 1973; William J. McGrath, Dionysian Art and Populist Politics in Austria, New Haven 1974.

6. From the turn of the century onward Budapest developed an intellectual milieu of interest for the history of sociology. An "Association for Social Science" had been founded there in 1900, and stimulated much sociological interest. Cf. Zoltán Horváth, Die Jahrhundertwende in Ungarn. Geschichte der zweiten Reformgeneration 1896-1914, Neuwied 1966; David Kettler,

Marxismus und Kultur. Mannheim und Lukács in den ungarischen Revolutionen 1918/1919, Neuwied und Berlin 1967; Arnold Hauser, Im Gespräch mit Georg Lukács, Munich 1978.

7. On this cf. the article by Helmut Fogt, Max Weber und die deutsche Soziologie der Weimarer Republik: Aussenseiter oder Gründervater? in this volume, and Gerhard Schroeter, Max Weber as Outsider: His Nominal Influence on German Sociology in the Twenties, in: Journal of the History of the Behavioural Sciences, 16th year, The apparently contradictory evaluation of Weber's influence in these two articles results from the application of different criteria of evaluation. On the whole one may probably say, since the complete works were available only after 1925 and are by nature not easily graspable, even the time factor makes any systematic reception unlikely before the beginning of the thirties, leaving aside the pieces already being widely discussed befor the war, notably the value judgement postulate, the protestantism thesis and the methodological writings. It was not until 1937 that the first comprehensive analysis of Max Weber's sociology appeared, by Talcott Parsons (The Structure of Social Action). It is not the rather late date that is remarkable, but the fact that this first systematic treatment of Max Weber's sociology should come from an American. This seems to me to say much about the history of Weber's influence in the inter-war period.

8. Cf. the articles by René König, Soziologie in Berlin um 1930 and Reinhold Knoll et al über die Soziologie in Wien, in this volume.

9. Cf. the article by Hans Linde, Soziologie in Leipzig 1925-1945,

in this volume.

10. C.H. Becker, Gedanken zur Hochschulreform, Leipzig 1919.

11. Georg von Below, Soziologie als Lehrfach in: Schmollers Jahrbücher, Bd. 43, 1919, Selständige Veröffentlichung München und Leipzig, 1920.

12. Ferdinand Tönnies, Hochschulreform und Soziologie, Jena 1920, S. 33.

13. On this cf. M. Rainer Lepsius, Gesellschaftsanalyse und Sinngebungszwang, in: Günter Albrecht u.a. (Hrsg), Soziologie, René König zum 65. Geburtstag, Opladen 1973.

14. Cf. Hans Freyer, Das politische Semester, ein Vorschlag zur Universitätsreform, Jena 1933; idem , Herrschaft und Planung, zwei Grundbegriffe der politischen Ethik, Hamburg 1933.

15. Cf. Wolfgang Schluchter, Wertfreiheit und Verantwortungsethik, in: idem , Rationalismus der Weltbeherrschung, Frankfurt 1980.

16. Cf. the article by Dirk Käsler, Der Streit um die Bestimmung der Soziologie auf den deutschen Soziologentagen 1910-1930, in this volume.

17. C.H. Becker, Vom Wesen der deutschen Universität, Leipzig 1925, p. 41.

18. Hans Lorenz Stoltenberg, Soziologie als Lehrfach an deutschen Hochschulen, Karlsruhe 1926.

19. Cf. Leopold von Wiese, Soziologie als Pflicht-oder Wahlfach an den reichsdeutschen Hochschulen, Kölner Vierteljahrshefte für Soziologie, Vol. VI (1926/27), p. 301 ff - here the following very contemporary sounding passage is to be found: "The consequence of our examination-bureaucratization is the annihilation of study for study's sake and its transformation into a "cramming" system, with the pullulation of coaches, and also the preference for allegedly practical subjects with their large volumes of material, and the extension of study in width instead of in depth" (p.302).

20. Stoltenberg, op. cit, p.19.

21. Cf. Leopold von Wiese, Die Frankfurter Dozententagung, Kölner Vierteljahrshefte für Soziologie, Vol. 10 (1931/32).

22. Karl Mannheim, Die Gegenwartsaufgaben der Soziologie, Tübingen 1932.

23. The quotes come from Karl Mannheim's work cited, from the following pages: 7, 8, 9, 11, 22, 24, 28, 31, 37, 33.

24. Cf. Ernst Jäckh (Ed.), Politik als Wissenschaft. Zehn Jahre Deutsche Hochschule für Politik, Berlin 1931; Ernst Jäckh und Otto Suhr, Geschichte der Deutschen Hoschschule für Politik, Berlin 1952.

25. Cf. Otto Antrick, Die Akademie der Arbeit in der Universität Frankfurt a.M., Darmstadt 1966.

26. On this cf. the article by Elfriede Üner, Jugendbewegung und Soziologie, in this volume In 1921 Leopold von Wiese had already edited Soziologie des Volksbildungswesens. Among the professors at teacher-training institutes were: Albert Salomon in Cologne, Frieda Wunderlich in Berlin, Ernst Kantorowicz and Käthe Mengelberg in Frankfurt. Otto Kirchheimer and many others worked in trade-union and political adult education.

27. On this cf. Herbert Döring, Der Weimarer Kreis. Studien zum politischen Bewusstsein verfassungstreuer Hochschullehrer in der Weimarer Republik, Meisenheim 1975, Fritz K. Ringer, The Decline of the German Mandarins, Cambridge 1969.

28. Franz L. Neumann, Wirtschaft, Staat, Demokratie, Aufsätze 1930-1954 ed. by Alfons Söllner, Frankfurt 1978, p. 418.

29. On this cf. the "Programme of the Series" :"we want a concrete sociology that seeks to understand contemporary social reality in its facts, decisive forces of formation and structural connections, and of course also in its historical roots". Printed on the inside front cover of the first volume of the series, Theodor Geiger, Die soziale Schichtung des deutschen Volkes, Stuttgart 1932. The inside back cover also displays the programme of the publication series as conceived in 1932. It lists the fol-

lowing volumes for early publication: Hans Beyer, Die Frau in der politischen Entscheidung. Eine statistisch-soziologische Untersuchung über das Frauenwahlrecht in Deutschland; Hans Speier, Soziologie der deutschen Angestelltenschaft (which was to appear only 1977, with the title Die Angestellten vor dem Nationalsozialismus, cf. the Foreword there); Svend Reimer, Die soziale Stellung des modernen Studenten; Charlotte Luetkens, Die Soziologie der amerikanischen Intelligenz, and many other "Forthcoming Works".

30. On the development of sociological research immediately before the power seizure, the findings of which could in part not be published except in the emigration, cf. M. Rainer Lepsius, Die sozialwissenschaftliche Emigration und ihre Folgen, in this volume. The thesis of the end of sociology before the National Socialist power seizure is maintained by Helmut Schelsky, Ortsbestimmung der deutschen Soziologie, Düsseldorf 1959, p. 36f.

31. On this cf. the article by Karl-Siegbert Rebberg, Philosopische Anthropologie und die "Soziologisierung" des Wissens vom Menschen, in this volume.

32. On this cf. the article by Carsten Klingemann, Heimatsoziologie oder Ordnungsinstrument? Fachgeschichtliche Aspekte der Soziologie in Deutschland zwischen 1933 and 1945, in this volume, and the literature references there.

33. On this cf. M. Rainer Lepsius, Die Entwicklung der Soziologie nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg 1945 bis 1967, in Günther Lüschen (Ed.), Deutsche Soziologie seit 1945, Sonderheft 21 der Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsycholgie, 1979, p. 26f, 62f. Also, for the loss of academic successors, the surveys appended to the article by M. Rainer Lepsius, Die sozialwissenschaftliche Emigration und ihre Folgen, in this volume.

34. Described in detail in my article in this volume.

THE EMIGRATION OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

BY

M. RAINER LEPSIUS

I.

Immediately after the National Socialist seizure of power, a large number of scholars were dismissed from the universities under the so-called law on the rehabilitation of the Civil Service. This "purge" aroused considerable international attention. Individuals and organizations strove to provide help and support[1]. This first wave of emigration in 1933 and 1934 was the most visible, including such already famous scholars as Albert Einstein and James Franck, Kurt Lewin and Erwin Panofsky Hans Kelsen, Ernst Cassirer and Ernst Kantorowicz, as well as, in the area of the social sciences proper, Karl Mannheim and Emil Lederer, to mention but a few. But this was only the beginning. In 1938 the number of émigrés rose considerably with the incorporation of Austria into the German Reich, the occupation of Czechoslovakia and the intensification of persecution of the Jews in Germany. Later came the secondary emigration of those who had found refuge initially in France, the Netherlands or Czechoslovakia and again found themselves under National Socialist power in 1939/40.

Sociological emigration from German-speaking Central Europe was a process stretching over some eight years and involving suces-

sively more countries. Germany was affected from 1933, with some, like Joseph Schumpeter[2], taking the opportunity to leave a country they saw no more future in even by 1932. Austria followed in 1934, after the violent suppression of the socialists. Thus, Paul F. Lazarsfeld finally left Vienna in 1935, and like him numbers of intellectuals belonging to the socialist camp had emigrated from Austria even before 1938[3]. The major part of the Austrian emigration came after Austria's incorporation into the German Reich and the ensuing persecution of the Jews and also of the Catholic camp. The Jewish or socialist German-speaking intelligentsia of Czechoslovakia, including refugees from Germany and Austria, had to emigrate after the occupation of the Sudetenland in 1938. Hungary is a special case: numbers of intellectuals had already emigrated from it for Austria and Germany in 1920 when the Horthy regime took power, now found themselves driven out once more, and since they used German as the language of their intellectual works should be counted towards the German-language emigration. Georg Lukács and Karl Mannheim may be taken as representative of them[4].

The emigration was particularly strong among intellectual and social circles that had been important for the formation of the social sciences since the turn of the centry. In the first place one may mention the unique cultural milieu of Central European Jewry, which had developed following Jewish emancipation and with increasing economic prosperity and intellectual assimilation to German culture, notably in Berlin and Frankfurt

and above all, of course, Vienna, but also in Budapest and Prague. The medium of the German language formed a link among Jewish intellectuals in Central Europe across national frontiers, and their achievements therefore enter directly into the development of German language culture, to which they had made themselves very receptive[5].

The emigration came, then, from the intellectual background of socialism and of the labour movement in all its forms; the religious socialism of such as Eduard Heimann and Paul Tillich, the intellectual Marxism of the the Frankfurt Institut für Sozialforschung, the pragmatically trade-union-oriented circle of younger social scientists like Franz Neuman and Ernst Fraenkel, Austromarxism and the communist camp. The close connection between socialism and the social sciences had existed since the end of the nineteenth century and had been renewed in the twenties with the turning of many younger social scientists towards adult education, journalism and the expanding trade unions. The new socio-political developments after the war and the entry of the social democrats into political leadership offered new areas of activity for those who supported a democratic and welfare-state renewal in Germany and Austria after the lost war. For many, scientific socialism and sociology were identical; for others, socialist-leaning attitudes were combined with philosophically open, methodically controlled social research. The close links between the intellectual milieu of socialism and the Jewish cultural milieu stamped the majority of the sociological emigration; this, however, was of decisively middle class rather than proletarian origins.

The more strictly academic university milieu of the sociological emigration covered a broad spectrum of theoretical approaches. Among these the most strongly represented are those endeavouring to free themselves from the historicism and idealism that had still dominated the pre-war period. Karl Mannheim's sociology of knowledge is perhaps the clearest attempt to destroy German idealism, and Schumpeter's theory of democracy the most forcible functionalization of the analysis of political processes without historical philosophical regress. If one adds that precisely those economists that were striving after a theoretical renewal of economics, such as Schumpeter, Löwe, Neisser, Hahn, Mann, Marschak and particularly Haberler, Machlup, Morgenstern and Tintner came from the Vienna school of Menger and Böhm-Bawerk, were disproportionately highly represented among the emigrants[6], it becomes clear that the social science emigration particularly weakened the methodically critical and theoretically innovative circles in the universities.

The emigration of the social sciences does not constitute a unity; it is heterogeneous in age, origin, and professional and political attitudes. It is constituted solely by a common biographical experience, namely the politically induced, if not compelled, emigration or flight from the area dominated by the National Socialist regime. This common experience affected the emigrants at very different stages of their lives: as older men for whom there could no longer be any new start; as professionally established people who could continue their career in another country or else had to seek a new occupation; as young men who managed to adapt themselves socially and professionally to another culture; or as children who, initially dependently, shared their parents' fate.

Everything connected with this exodus has repeatedly been described: the difficulties in exit, the often prolonged search for entry permits, the economic and social uncertainty, language problems, the changing personal conception of what was inititally regarded as only a temporary period of asylum (especially for the emigrants settled in Paris, but also among many in the USA or Britain) into an acceptance of permanent immigration and integration into the host country, the choices between the maintenance of a German cultural identity and a radical rejection not only of Nazi Germany, but also of the German language and culture, and the construction of a new psychic, social and political identity in the host country[7]. We should like merely to recall them here with these few keywords Any forced migration has extreme consequences for those affected, and in general only those are remembered who managed successfully to overcome the difficulties, to continue intellectual life and literary production, to make their names known. Many did not make it; no literary references remember them. Only in rare cases can these hazards and chances of a life history be discovered, as is true of the fates of those who did not manage to escape death in the concentration camps[8].

The definition of the circle of persons who can be counted towards the emigration is difficult and hard to give without being arbitrary. In the twenties and thirties, sociology was still insufficiently differentiated as a discipline, and institutional criteria are therefore lacking. The "sociological perspective" developed after the First World War in a broad scatter over the disciplines and was often applied by people outside the university context. The July 1929 membership list of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie, as far as I know the last one printed, lists 151 members,

of which, on a generous estimate, some 50 can be described as sociologists, with 50 being economists, 13 lawyers, 7 philosophers and the rest splitting up between historians, technologists, psychologists and people not academically active. This shows the state of affairs among people who were already academically established, since only these could become members of the Gesellschaft. Political science did not yet exist as an academic discipline in the Weimar Republic. However, the Deutsche Hochschule für Politik provided an institutional basis for sociological reflection on the democratic process which was of great importance for political sociology and expanded the traditional historical and legal understanding of politics. In principle, social science emigration will be taken below to mean people who before or after emigration were working in fields that can be reckoned to lie in the present disciplines of sociology and political science. The boundaries are of course unclear, and some individuals will therefore be given consideration who by profession were economists, psychologists or lawyers. In general, however, these disciplines will be left aside, as will the historians, philosophers and educationists.
This is of course problematic, since such people as Kurt Lewin and Karl Popper are of greater importance for the development of the social sciences internationally than many who count as sociologists and political scientists in the narrow disciplinary sense[9].

The line of demarcation with politicians and publicists is also vague. Many politicians and publicists that never held an academic post contributed considerably to the development of the social sciences. This is especially true of such socialist theoreticians as Otto Bauer, Rudolf Hilferding and Karl Kautsky. Many changed from a political to an academic career following emigration, such as Heinrich Brüning, Arnold Brecht, Hans Staudinger, and Hans Simons

and are therefore counted among the sociological emigration. Ernst Reuter returned to politics as Mayor of Berlin following brief academic activity. Finally, many émigrés wrote descriptions and analyses of National Socialism, notably Konrad Heiden and Hermann Rauschning, without thereby becoming social scientists.

The psychoanalysts are in general left out, though Sigmund Freud's importance for the social sciences cannot be underestimated, coming out as it does particularly in the work of Talcott Parsons. However, only those who had a direct relationship with social science research will be counted towards the sociological emigration, such as Erich Fromm and Bruno Bettelheim[10].

In considering the consequences of the emigration, its unclear external boundaries and its internal heterogeneity have to be accepted. This makes it harder to pick out its effects than is the case with the emigration of scientists. Nevertheless, it represents an unique event in academic history, which deserves much more detailed analysis than will be possible here.

II

The consequences of the forced emigration affect first of all the development of the social sciences in Germany and Austria. Certainly, the question of what would have happened if emigration had not taken place cannot be answered. However, some criteria can be designated that may serve as a basis for hypothetical verdicts.

A first criterion results from the political persecution of Marxism

and the suppression of the labour movement from 1933 in Germany and from 1934 in Austria. The close connections between socialism and the social sciences have already been mentioned; the exodus of socialist intellectuals thus hit the social sciences particularly hard. The emigration meant the breaking off of the Marxist academic tradition in the strict sense in German-speaking Central Europe, an area where it had hitherto been of special importance. In view of the suppression of socialism in Fascist Italy, the intellectual decay of Marxism under Stalinism in the Soviet Union and the breakdown of Marxist positions among emigrants in the USA, the interruption of the Marxist social sciences in Germany and Austria is an internationally important event in academic history. It was not till thirty years later that this academic tradition was revived, by a new generation. The gap between those generations was bridged in the Federal Republic notably by the Frankfurt School, which takes on great importance in academic history from this function[11].

The interruption of Marxist sociology in the narrower sense went hand in hand with a weakening of the macro-sociological structural analysis of capitalism that was characteristic of German sociology before the First World War. The social sciences had developed in German-speaking Central Europe since the mid-nineteenth century through grappling with Karl Marx and the taking of positions against the idealistic philosophies of history and the historicist conception of social change. The interruption of the Marxist academic tradition therefore had a direct effect on so-called bourgeois sociology. Moreover, a large part of the intelligentsia politically inclined to socialism in no way represented dogmatic Marxism. Examples are Emil Lederer, Theodor Geiger, Franz Neumann, Eduard

Heimann, Paul Lazarsfeld and many others. The emigration of these people decisively weakened interest in macro-sociological structural analyses. The academic programme of sociology, on the one hand to identify analytically the causes of human behaviour and the reasons that determine its homogeneity and its change (out of the philosophies of history), and on the other to generalize them beyond historical case-histories, was severely restricted by the emigration. The long dispute between history and sociology, idealism and materialism, holism and individualism, was decided in favour of the first-named positions through the emigration; there was a one-sided selection among academic programmes.

A second criterion can be deduced from the peculiarities of the social sciences left behind in Germany and their programme. Quite apart from the political and ideological pressure and influence of National Socialism, it can be found that following departure of the émigrés and the suppression of liberal sociologists that stayed behind in Germany, a tradition with a long pre-Nazi history came to the fore; "ethno-sociology". It was not "society", seen as an "artificial" construction, but the"natural" and "organic" subject of history, the Volk, that should be the object of sociology. The old opposition to industrialization, urbanization, bureaucratization and the legalization of social relationships, and the institutionalization of authority relationships, was able to impose itself over the tradition of sociology denoted as Marxist and liberal.

Classes differentiated socio-economically were replaced by the natural structure of the social orders socially conditioned and therefore changeable social behaviour by the ascription of permanent character traits to groups of people, professions, peoples, races,

the analysis of complexes of differing interests, conflicts of interests and opportunities of power by the idea of the ethnic community and the homogeneity of interests under institutionally undetermined authority relationships[12].

The emigration was bound up with a regression in the analytical differentiation of sociological self-examination already achieved in the transition from pre-industrial to industrial society, and a prolongation and revival of the scholarly importance of romanticism. It is therefore hardly surprising that the peasant, the country people, the village, ethnic-German settlements elsewhere and area planning all became preferred subjects of social science research after 1933. The retreat into pre-industrial society was also connected with a preference for pre-democratic political conceptions, of "natural" authority and of personally legitimized leadership.

This trend was, moreover, stengthened by the influence of the emigration of psychologists, which will not be further gone into here but which very strongly affected the orientation of the social and behavioral sciences[13]. Even though the reception of psychoanalysis by the social sciences before 1933/1938 had been only very rudimentary, and essentially restricted to the circle of Max Horkheimer and Erich Fromm, the suppression of psychoanalysis led to the same result: the breakdown of already developed analytical categories for man's thinking about himself in relation to the structuring of human behaviour brought about by the individual's social environment. The almost complete emigration of the German and Austrian psychoanalysts had other major consequences in intellectual history, especially because in the USA they were almost wholly absorbed into

therapy of the upper middle class.

There are a number of other criteria that allow consequences of emigration for the history of scholarship to be drawn.

The invigoration of empirical social research which set in right at the start of the thirties came to an end. This was true especially of the impulses that sprang from the Austrian Economic Psychology Research Centre in Vienna, under the intellectual leadership of Paul Lazarsfeld. The importance of this innovative centre of empirical social research is represented even today by the noted study "The Unemployed of Marienthal" (1933). It may further be presumed that the developments in empirical social research bound up with the work of Paul Lazarsfeld in the USA could equally have taken place in Austria if the political position following 1934 had permitted. One may certainly assume that this research centre would have had an influence on the whole German-speaking area, if it had existed longer[14]. In this connection one should also mention aggregate data analysis, best represented by Theodor Geiger's study on "The Social Stratification of the German People" (1932)[15].

Finally, in methodological respects, the social ecology study by Rudolf Heberle, "The Rural Population and National Socialism" (completed 1934), also deserves mention for its pioneering character. Also of methodological importance are the "Studies on Authority and Family" of the Frankfurt Institute für Sozialforschung (1936), which introduced empirical attitude research. All these impulses in the field of empirical social research could no longer be received in Germany and Austria, for they appeared immediately before the seizure

of power or even in emigration. We therefore have a situation where the innovative contributions to empirical social research made in the early thirties in Germany and Austria after the war were not to be reckoned as part of German language social science. The developments in empirical research that took place in the thirties and forties are generally regarded as an American import alien to a presumed German tradition of social science research[16].

In connection with the invigoration of empirical research, there developed also a manifold social-critical social research on social problems of the twenties and early thirties which, like empirical social research in the narrower sense, perished with the emigration. Particularly worthy of mention here is the area of research on white collar workers, which brought out new findings starting with the work of Emil Lederer, which later influenced the work of C. Wright Mills but could no longer meet with acceptance in Germany. This is true, for instance, of the work of Hans Speier, "Sociology of the German Clerical Class" (completed 1933), of Carl Dreyfuss, "Occupation and Ideology of White Collar Workers" (1933) of Emil Grünberg, "The Middle Class in Capitalist Society" (1932) and of Siegfried Karkauer "White Collar Workers" (1930)[17].

Industrial sociological work by Goetz Briefs and others took as a topic the problem of the constitution of firms, distinguishing themselves thereby from the purely time-and-motion approach to the problem which continued after 1933[18].

Also of particular interest is the rapid reaction of sociological research to the National Socialist electoral successes after 1930.

Theodor Geiger, Svend Riemer, Hans Speier and Rudolf Heberle, as well as Max Horkheimer, Erich Fromm, Leo Löwenthal and Herbert Marcuse of the Frankfurt Institut für Sozialforschung were among those who after 1930 turned to the sociological analysis of National Socialism[19].

Finally, one should mention empirically-based sociology of youth, which became visible in the late twenties and early thirties with work by Lisbeth Franzen-Hellersberg, Hildegard Hetzer, Paul Lazarsfeld and Adolf Busemann[20].

On the whole it may be said that from around 1928 there was a marked invigoration of empirical and applied social research, standing in contrast to the more theoretical, philosophical and historical approaches of the foregoing years. This new development was hard hit by emigration, and its findings were not systematically absorbed either then or after the war. These studies in particular seem to me to express a new impulse in the social sciences in Germany and Austria that stamps the beginning of the thirties not as the expiry but a revival of the social sciences. The thesis repeatedly advanced by Helmut Schelsky that National Socialism did not bring sociology in Germany to an end but that sociology had come to its own end is an expression of the failure to perceive the new impulses at the beginning of the thirties[21]. This leads to a misconception of the academic history which not only minimizes the importance of emigration and National Socialism for the development of the social sciences in Germany but goes on to construct a conception of sociology for which empirical social research's potential for enlightenment and for social criticism is put in second place to the interpretation of the

philosophy of history.

The sociological emigration was not merely the departure of a number of people but also - if one may say so - a departure of specific sociological paradigms. The emigrants were also the stewards of the heritage of the great plans of Max Weber, Georg Simmel, of the sociology of knowledge, criticism of ideology and political science. The last important work on Max Weber appeared in Germany in 1934. This was Alexander von Schelting's Max Weber's Wissenshaftslehre, Tübingen 1934, and Schelting too was among the émigrés. Georg Simmel could no longer be systematically treated under the Third Reich, if for no other reason than that he was a Jew. The decisive continuation of the line of sociology of knowledge and criticism of ideology was achieved by Theodor Geiger in emigration. The macro-sociological heritage of Karl Marx was politically tabooed. The new approaches of a sociologically orientated political science were wiped out with the emigration of Schumpeter, Hermens, Heller, Sigmund Neumann, Franz Neumann, Otto Kirchheimer and Ernst Fraenkel. Whatever sociological potential was left behind in Germany and Austria was lopsidedly restricted to the heritage of German idealism, to a transformation of sociological structural analysis into a politically indifferent anthropology or a politically relevant biology, to a description of selective processes of population growth, migrations, settlements and the like. The more strictly sociological paradigms, the attempt to explain human behaviour on the basis of the structural conditions of human social life, died out. Not everything that has to do with the description and explanation of social phenomena is ipso facto social science. It is not the object of study that determines a science, but the approach. In this sense the seizure of power by National Socialism also meant the end of sociology.

One further consequence should be mentioned. In terms of numbers, the emigration decimated the sociological potential of Germany and Austria. The positions left by the émigrés were no longer occupied by sociologists, whether in the Universities or in the technical and pedagogical colleges. But especially, the whole generation of younger scientists who continued to graduate up to 1933/1934, could no longer pursue any further academic career in Germany or Austria, and left Central Europe. The departure of this generation made the break in tradition, which after all only lasted 12 years, all the sharper.

I I I

While the consequences of the emigration for the source countries have to date hardly been studied, its effects on the countries of destination met with great interest from the outset[22]. Admittedly this is true only of the United States, but that was where the intellectual and academic émigrés overwhelmingly went. Initially, America was in no way the preferred goal of the intellectual refugees; many would rather have stayed in Europe. Paris and London were the most important places of exile, especially for those who continued to work in political organizations in exile or at least hoped for a quick end to National Socialism in Germany. It was only with time that the concentration of refugees in the USA built up. The immigration regulations contributed to this: scholars able to show a two-year job contract were exempt from the immigration quotas, and after the fall of France in 1940 special methods were adopted to ease the entry of refugees. Individuals, notably Alwin Johnson[23], director of the New School for Social Research, as well as foundations and organizations in America, provided immense assistance. But more than anything, the US university

system proved more elastic and more willing to take foreigners in than in any other country. It was therefore only in the USA that the sociological emigration took on an intellectual and academic importance, even though individuals managed to come to the fore and exercise influence in other countries. Examples are, for instance, Theodor Geiger in Denmark, though because of his early death (1952) his influence remained limited.

Of the numerous people who first fled to Britain, most later went to the USA, though some went to Commonwealth countries. It was only in 1945 when he came back from New Zealand that Karl Popper won his great international influence, at the London School of Economics. Karl Mannheim developed great activities in London, especially as founder and editor of the influential International Library of Sociology and Social Reconstruction, but neither his sociology of knowledge nor his interest in questions of education for the social "reconstruction of society" had repercussions in Britain after his early death in 1947. Norbert Elias, who did not gain a Chair in Britain until 1954 (till 1962), acquired his present reputation through interest in him in the Netherlands, and later on in West Germany[24]. While Britain offered many émigrés protection and a living, any further-reaching influence of the sociological émigres remained on an individual basis, as exemplified by Norbert Elias's cultural sociology and Arnold Hauser's sociology of art; these were already developed before emigration, and their influence was international rather than specifically British.

In other European countries the sociological emigration had even less effect. In France, the numerous German and Austrian émigrés remained without influence. They had to flee again after the

German occupation; some fell into National Socialist hands and were carried off to the concentration camps. The same was true of the émigrés in the Netherlands. For the European countries the emigration was a transitory phenomenon; even in Switzerland it had no effects going beyond the personal and mostly brief activity of individuals[26].

Outside Europe, the sociological émigrés made their way only in a very scattered fashion. The academic possibilities of making a living were extremely limited there. Most had to earn their living by business, and only a few managed to do scholarly work at the same time[27]. Two special cases must be mentioned. The first is Turkey, which is the only case where the emigration temporarily played a role as deliberately applied development aid for the modernization of a country[28]. The other case is Palestine, which in the thirties and forties and before the creation of the State of Israel could offer an academic living to only a very few scholars. For the emigration in the social sciences in particular, Palestine has a secondary role, apart from the singular position of Martin Buber.

The effects of the emigration can, then, meaningfully be discussed only in regard to the United States. But here too it is hard to evaluate the consequences. On the one hand, the émigrés, as already said, were heterogeneous in academic interests, methodological approach and intellectual background[29], so that no specifically definable academic paradigme of the social sciences can be connected with them. On the other hand, the effects of the social sciences are always diffusely related to the contemporary culture, and are hard to ascribe to individual "innovations" or approaches. The influence of émigré physicists is therefore far easier to determine, and this is equally possible for art-

historians, since art-history as a discipline became established only the thirties, essentially by German émigrés in the USA[30]. But the social sciences had long existed in the United States. Their expansion had gone further than in Germany and Austria; the sociological emigration brought no new "discipline", and is not connected with any specific direction of development that would not have come about in the USA in any case without it. It has therefore been assumed that the emigration of sociologists had manifold diffuse consequences, bound up with the work of individuals and of groups. The American universities' willingness and ability to accept the émigrés led to their dispersion and integration, to their incorporation individually into the American academic system.

The famous special case of a closed social group formation, largely determined by the émigrés themselves, is the graduate faculty of the New School for Social Research, planned by Alvin Johnson as a "University in Exile". Its location in New York, the centre of the German-Austrian, Jewish, intellectual emigration, gave it an environment in which a specifically German academic life could survive. Its members remained bound to the idea of the old German "Staatswissenschaften" and could not compete with the increasing academic specialization of the individual social science disciplines. By comparison with the leading universities, the New School was restricted. Only a few American scholars originally were trained there. Emil Lederer died in 1939, Albert Salomon and Carl Meyer concentrated on the history of sociology and published little, Hans Speier and Gerhard Colm acquired their influence through other positions, and Alfred Schütz spent only a few years as full-time professor in the New School. The New School's special position

did give it a unique character until the end of the fifties, but it was precisely that special position that hindered its chances of diffusion into the American academic system[31].

A second special position existed for the émigrés at Columbia University, New York. Among those who taught there, with great influence on younger scholars, were Paul Lazarsfeld, and for a short time also Franz Neumann. Both had great, though quite contradictory influence; Lazarsfeld as promoter of empirical social research, Neumann as promoter of a thorough theoretical foundation for political science[32]. Columbia University also acted as a host for the Institut für Sozialforschung, even if the institute had hardly any direct influence on the University. A self-incapsulation as an exile institution is characteristic of the Institute, rather than the attempt to reach out into the American academic system. Precisely for that reason, the Institute for Social Research deserves special consideration, which it has in fact already had in the literature[33]. It is parallel to the New School to the extent that both academic environments belonged to the exile rather than to the immigration, so that Horkheimer and Adorno were quite consistent in terminating their exile after the war and returning to the Federal Republic. It was not until they had done so that the "Frankfurt School" in the narrower sense took on its academic importance after the war. The individual representatives of the Frankfurt school would no doubt have had an influence in the USA without the Institute's return to Germany, as did Herbert Marcuse and Leo Löwenthal, but the perception of a specific "school" would scarcely have arisen[34].

The University of Chicago was another place where émigrés were

concentrated, and there the sociologists met with the concept of a broad humanist college education, fathered by president Robert M. Hutchins. Hans Morgenthau had influence on political science, and Leo Strauss on political philosophy.

Hannah Arendt, Paul Tillich, Joachim Wach, Arnold Bergstraesser, Bert Hoselitz, Hans Rothfels and Hans Zeisel also taught in Chicago, gaining access to a broad elite of American students.

Mention must finally be made in this connection with the Catholic University of Notre Dame, which played an important part, with the collaboration of the émigrés, in bringing about the academic independence of the social sciences within the Catholic university system. The Review of Politics edited and published there by Waldemar Gurian offered many emigrants, particularly conservative and Catholic ones, a respected platform.

The sociological émigrés' chances of influence depended largely on their placement in the American university system, i.e. on whether they were working at a university with a graduate school and could influence potential academic teachers and scholars there or not. Columbia University played an important role with Lazarsfeld and Franz Neumann, and later Kirchheimer, Edinger and Blau. Many of the younger émigrés also graduated there, thereafter finding posts in the New York City colleges system. Besides these mention must be made of the influence of such people as Hans Gerth at the University of Winsconsin, Leo Löwenthal and Reinhard Bendix at the University of California in Berkeley those already mentioned at the University of Chicago, Lewis Coser, Herbert Marcuse and Kurt Wolff at Brandeis University, Paul Honigsheim at Michigan State University,

Werner Landecker at the University of Michigan, Svend Riemer at the University of California in Los Angeles, Emilio Willems at the Vanderbilt University, Karl Deutsch in Yale and Harvard, Harry Eckstein and Suzanne Keller in Princeton [35]. These are all personal influences, of very different content, but of very great importance for the generation of American social scientists that went to university after the war. One can scarecely quantify, but it can be said that, with a relatively wide spread over the country's leading universities, a fairly large transfer of academic traditions and educational approaches from German-speaking Europe took place. Many American social scientists today about fifty years old have given accounts of these intellectual impacts. A relatively large number of the émigrés personally won great influence, as is also expressed in the fact that many of them were elected president of the American Sociological Association: Bendix, Blau, Coser, Lazarsfeld.

The older émigré generation is linked by one theme, the attempt to explain the preconditions, functioning and consequences of National Socialism. The most important academic achievement of the émigrés as a group is the "totalitarianism research", in the broadest sense. This is the field where one finds the "great books" of the émigrés, which both had a strong response at the time they came out, and gained lasting academic importance.

Among these "great books", in alphabetical order of authors' names, were: Th. W. Adorno, Else Frenkel-Brunswik, Daniel Levinson, Nevitt R. Sanford, The Authoritarian Personality, New York 1950; Hannah Arendt, The Origins of Totalitarianism, New York 1951 (German 1955); Franz Borkenau, The Totalitarian Enemy, London 1939; Peter F. Drucker, The End of Economic Man. A Study of the New Totalitarianism

London, 1939; Ernst Fraenkel, The Dual State, New York 1941 (German 1974); Erich Fromm, Escape from Freedom, New York 1941 (German 1945); Friedrich A. von Hayek, The Road to Serfdom, London, 1944 (German 1947); Eduard Heimann, Communism, Fascism and Democracy, New York 1938; Max Horkheimer and Theodor W Adorno, Dialektik der Aufklärung, 1944, Amsterdam 1947; Karen Horney, the Neurotic Personality of Our Time, New York 1937 (German 1951); Emil Lederer, State of the Masses, New York 1940 (German in abridgement 1979); Adolf Löwe, The Price of Liberty, London 1937; Karl Lövenstein, Hitler's Germany, New York 1940; Karl Mannheim, Mensch und Gesellschaft im Zeitalter des Umbaus, Leiden 1935; idem., Diagnosis of our Time, London 1943; Ludwig von Mises, Omnipotent Government, The Rise of the Total State and Total War, New Haven 1944; Franz Neumann, Behemoth, London 1943 (German 1977); Sigmund Neumann, Permanent Revolution, Totalitarianism in the Age of International Civil War, New York 1942; Helmuth Plessner, Das Schicksal deutschen Geistes im Ausgang seiner bürgerlichen Epoche, Zürich 1935 (Post-war edition entitled "Die verspätete Nation, Stuttgart 1959); Herman Rauschning, Die Revolution des Nihilismus, Zürich 1938; Wilhelm Röpke, Die Gesellschaftskrisis der Gegenwart, Erlenbach - Zürich 1942; idem., Civitas humana, Erlenbach - Zürich 1944; Alexander Rüstow, Ortsbestimmung der Gegenwart, 3 Vols., Erlenbach - Zürich 1951 - 1957; Joseph A. Schumpeter, Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy, New York 1942 (German 1946); Eric Voegelin, Order and History, Vol. I, Baton Rouge 1956.

However differently these authors proceed and whatever findings they come to, they have in common the experience of a fundamental structural break in historical, political and social development

bound up with National Socialism. The act of reflection on the unforeseen collapse of bourgeois society, that had not been predicted in this form, was performed by this generation of émigrés. Except for Alfred Weber and Alfred von Martin the sociologists that stayed behind in Germany did not deal with the matter, even after the war. Accordingly, these books - and a host of other papers and articles - constitute the most important attempt at a treatment of National Socialism from a contemporary German perspective. These books are, then, of extrordinary importance; they constitute the reaction of the German social sciences to National Socialism[36]. After the war, National Socialism was rarely taken as an object of study by social scientists - analysis being left to historians. The result is that the experience of Nazism remained without influence on the concept formation and approaches of sociology. The social sciences in Germany and Austria were therefore reconstructed after the war, just as if national socialism, its system of domination, mass loyalties, propaganda techniques, disciplining and disfranchisement of the population, persecution of the Jews and mass murder did not constitute any challenge to the social sciences. It is one of the peculiarities of German post-war sociology that it has left both National Socialism and the Communist system of rule and of society in East Germany almost completely untouched, thereby failing to deal with two phenomena of fundamental importance for the society of the Federal Republic[37]. Systematic analysis of the émigrés' work is therefore all the more important, even if they had far fewer sources available than we have today. But not even this has been done; much work was translated into German only very late, some not noticed at all.

To sketch out the significance of those works in a few words, we

may perhaps state the following, without going into details of the argumentation.

One theme is the question of the connection between economic order and totalitarian system, taken up particularly in the work of Hayek, Mises, Röpke and Rustow. The answer has been to the effect that a liberal economic order also secures a liberal political order, if it is not indeed a condition of it. The consequence they drew from National Socialism was, then, the political and moral refoundation of liberalism. This group is frontally opposed to the thesis that National Socialism is the result of capitalism and to the Marxist literature built thereupon. It regards both socialist economic planning and a monopoly economy as degenerations of the liberal market economy and bases its hopes to find the basis for a liberal political order on the restoration of a market-oriented, competition-based economy. This thesis was of great political and intellectual influence immediately after 1945, as can be seen from the fact that the corresponding literature was available in the Western zones even before 1948. It met with an echo in the views of the Freiburg school around Walter Eucken[38] and made a considerable contribution to the acceptance and to the theoretical foundation of the "social market economy" programme after the currency reform. But its effects were also notable in the USA, not as a contribution to economic theory, but as a reinforcement of free-enterprise, market-economy ideas, which up to the present continues to be organized politically by the "Free Enterprise" Association[39].

A second theme of these writings was the connection between personality structure and political system. The "authoritarian personality"

is supposed to correspond to the authoritarian political system, and certain characteristics of the social structure to the expression of "neurotic", "authoritarian" or "sado-masochistic" personalities. On this view, totalitarian regimes are an expression of personality structures that "flee from freedom". The issues brought out in the work of Horney and Fromm, the authors of The Authoritarian Personality, of the connection between personality, social structure and political system, go beyond old ideas of a "national character" or a "class culture" and open up a field of research that is still open today and has produced influential studies[40].

An explanatory argument that was important in the context of the times was directed to the analysis of "mass society" and the dangers inherent in it for a pluralist democracy[41]. In the further course of the debate, this line of argumentation was linked up with personality structure (for instance in Riesman's Lonely Crowd), but also extended to organizational characteristics of interest representation. Thus, Lederer's State of the Masses links up with William Kornhauser's The Politics of Mass Society (Glencoe 1959) and the studies on the function of intermediary groups related to it.

Schumpeter's book introduced a new sociological analysis of the conditions for the functioning of democracy, and belongs among the works of the immigrants that continue to be influential today. The collapse of the Weimar Republic, a highly institutionalized system of interest representation through parties and associations, in a political culture traditionally devoted to the idea of the rule of law, brought the social conditions of democracy into the foreground, a field where apart from

Schumpeter, also Ernst Fraenkel, Franz Neumann, Sigmund Neumann and Otto Kirchheimer have made important contributions. This was where a new political sociology was founded, as the functional analysis of the democratic process[42].

Beside the functional analysis of democracy there is the functional analysis of National Socialism, which was what the concept of totalitarianism was first applied to. The work of H. Arendt S. Neumann, F. Neumann and E. Fraenkel was the starting point for totalitarianism research that developed beyond National Socialism to include, since the fifties, also Communist systems of rule. The concept of totalitarianism thereby took on a political character in connection with the Cold War that went beyond its original and analytical and descriptive goals. The concept of totalitarianism has since begun to disintegrate, with stress both on the specificity of Soviet Communism and of National Socialism, and a revision of the characteristics of the Third Reich's totalitarianism. But this disintegration has not been followed by any new theoretical conception on the analysis of non-democratic systems of rule, so that the research programme taken as a theme by the authors mentioned is still open. Both a "theory of authoritarian societies" and a structural comparison among such societies is lacking; to provide them was the intention then. On the one hand, then, the totalitarianism research of the sociological emigration was very influential, but on the other the program has remained uncompleted[43].

Finally, as a reaction to the experience of National Socialism, ideas of intellectual history and universal history have been brought to bear on the bourgeois epoch, and here too an important

stimulus came from the sociological emigration. Prominent here are Horkheimer and Adorno's book on the Dialectics of Enlightenment which put its stamp on the later basic orientation of the Institut für Sozialforschung in Frankfurt, and the outlines of universal history by Rüstow and Voegelin. These writings stand within a German intellectual tradition that has a sociological content only in an indirect way, but represents the universal-history approach that was so characteristic of older German sociology.

A second important aspect of the emigration as a group was the diffusion and further development by many of its members of the heritage of German sociology, in a time when this heritage was not systematically cultivated and continued in Germany: from 1933/34 until far into the sixties. Many émigrés helped to translate classical German sociology to a greater extent into English, thereby making it accessible world-wide. These translations led to the bringing out of influential volumes of selections, among which the volume edited by Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills, From Max Weber, 1st ed. New York 1946, continues to make its mark today. Naturally, these translations have not been considered in Germany, though many of the introductions to them are still important today. To be sure, the spread of the heritage of the classical German sociology has also been promoted by non-émigrés, notably Talcott Parsons and Edward Shils, but the breadth of the dissemination is nevertheless essentially to be ascribed to the members of the emigration, who also contributed to the further development of the heritage. One can only mention the importance of Reinhard Bendix for the dissemination of Max Weber, and Lewis Coser and Kurt H. Wolff for that of Georg Simmel, the two most important representatives

of classical German sociology[44]. The emigration thus became the vehicle for the very tradition of German sociology that had striven for the development of the sociological explanatory programme in the narrower sense. The neglect of this tradition when sociology began again after the war in Germany showed that the social scientists left behind in Germany were only partly familiar with this programme, and that interest in the classical tradition was aroused in large part only in response to its dissemination in American sociology.

As the émigrés became integrated and assimilated, their political and academic approaches also began to change. American empiricism and pragmatism proved stronger than German Marxism and idealism. Interestingly, the émigrés did not write important books on American society: they always remained rather outside it, and at the same time they had lost the distance of an analytical perspective based on a view of the whole of society or a philosophy of history. It may thus be said that while the émigrés did transfer sociological traditions to the USA, their transmission function was selective. Although many of them had acquired socialist orientations and some even represented Marxist theories in the narrower sense, the emigration did hardly bring about any transfer of the Marxist tradition in the German social sciences to America. In part this is perhaps explainable from the situation of emigration, and it was in any case more difficult after the change in political climate following 1948, but the major factor is probable the circumstance that the émigrés, cut off from the German and Austrian academic communities, found themselves facing an environment which, because of its ethnically chequered composition and different type of interest organization in particular the lack of a labour movement,

resisted Marxist interpretations. In any case, as far as the history of science goes, it can probably be said that while the majority of émigrés came from a socialist oriented background, they became liberals in America, so that the great motivational and intellectual tradition in the German and Austrian social sciences was broken off[45].

The American political and intellectual environment was not receptive to the socialist line of tradition: it also rejected German idealism and historicism. Nevertheless, the sociological emigration contributed to the strengthening of the theoretical and historical stiffening of the social sciences in America. Here too, however, one should not lose sight of the fact that the turn from an empiricist and casuist sociology to a more strongly theoretical and historically comparative sociology had already been embarked on by American sociologists at the end of the thirties, and was in full swing by the end of the forties. Talcott Parsons' The Structure of Social Action appeared in 1937, his Social System in 1951, the first edition of Robert K. Merton's collection of essays, Social Theory and Social Structure, in 1949, and The Human Group by George C. Homans in 1950. Structural-functional sociology, which came to prominence in the fifties and sixties, had arisen without any essential contributions from the émigrés. Against this, important émigré impact fell outside the theoretical turn towards structural functionalism; for instance, Reinhart Bendix's contribution to comparative sociology, Alfred Schütz's to phenomenological sociology, or Lewis Coser's to the sociology of intellectuals and the history of social thought.

Around the turn of the fifties political sociology took on a new theoretical and historically comparative approach, which likewise cannot be ascribed to the émigrés alone, even though they contributed significantly. Mention has already been made of Paul Lazarsfeld's work; Karl Deutsch published National-ism and Social Communication in 1953, and The Nerves of Govern-ment in 1963. The American Voter, the first systematic descrip-tion of moderen electoral sociology, appeared in 1960 without émigré contributions, and the same is true for the beginning of internationally comparative political sociology, which can per-haps be seen in The Civic Culture of 1963, by Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba, and Political Man of 1960, by S.M. Lipset.

The emigration of social scientists did not merely maintain the German American relationships that had been interrupted by National Socialism, the war and the first post-war years for almost a generation, but strengthened them. They acted as a bridge, stand-ing in the continuity of the social sciences in America and in German-speaking Central Europe. Even before the First World War there had been close relationships: the German university was the model for the graduate schools in the American universities, a period of study in Germany was attractive for young American scientists and brought prestige, so that at first there was a rather asymmetrical orientation of the Americans towards Germany. German immigrants had also played a role in the American social sciences early on[46]. After 1945 heavy immigration of social scientists to the USA began again, and intellectual relations became stronger than they had ever been. But now the orientation was reversed: America became the model for the development of the social

sciences in Germany. Between the two phases came the forced emigration and at the same time the change in the direction of the orientations between the two countries. While German science had had great prestige, it was present in America in emigration. It was no longer necessary to look to Germany, far less study there. American social science was not only more productive than European social science, but had also taken over the European heritage itself, and thus won independence from Europe in this respect too.

IV

There is room here for only a brief outline of the significance of the social science emigration for the post-war development of the social sciences in Germany and Austria. The direct political influence should certainly not be underestimated, though it has not yet been studied in detail. Many émigrés worked during the war and in the first post-war years in American administrative departments and in the occupation administration, and some had great influence as advisers[47]. Among the most important were perhaps Gerhard Colm, for currency reform, and Hans Simons, for the shaping of the Basic Law - the two most important pillars of the Federal Republic's order. Stress should also be laid on Hans Kelsen's influence on the Charter of the United Nations, even if this is outside the framework of German-American relationships.

In the narrower sense of academic influence, return migration was of greater importance. The refoundation of sociology and political science was largely thanks to people

coming back from emigration. René König in Cologne, Helmuth Plessner in Göttingen, and Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno in Frankfurt were among the most important figures in sociology as it was reborn; Siegfried Landshut in Hamburg, Ernst Fraenkel in Berlin, Arnold Bergstraesser in Freiburg, and Carl Joachim Friedrich in Heidelberg were of equal importance for the grounding of political science[48]. Altogether some forty-two sociologists and political scientists returned from emigration to the Federal Republic, East Germany and Austria. Most came to the Federal Republic; only a few, who had retained a more strictly Marxist orientation, went to the GDR[49].

Those that returned to the Federal Republic after 1955 no longer had any formative influence on sociology and political science, since the formative phase ended around then. Returns before 1948/1949, i.e. before the economic and political reorganization of political life in the Federal Republic, were hardly likely[50], and the decisive period for returning émigrés' chances of influence is thus confined to brief period of five years or so. But it was not only those who came back permanently that had great influence; some who came as visitors while retaining their American chairs were of considerable importance. Such were notably Franz Neumann and Sigmund Neumann, who promoted the refoundation of the Deutsche Hochschule für Politik in Berlin, and also many others who provided contacts and acquaintanceships for the first post-war generations. Paul Lazarsfeld concerned himself with the development of social science in Vienna, contributing decisively to the founding of the Institut für Höhere Studien there. The influence of the émigrés should not therefore be seen as confined only to those who returned permanently, but as extending to a far wider circle of people who contributed to the training of

the first post-war generation both as visiting professors and in American universities. The vast majority of those who obtained Chairs in sociology and political science in the universities in the sixties had studied in America and thereby came in contact with émigrés whom they have to thank for a direct introduction into the academic situation in the United States.

Most of the influential émigrés in the formative phase in the fifties belonged to a generation that had been between twenty-five and forty on emigration, and thus had completed or at least begun their studies while still in Germany or Austria, but were still young enough to be "papabili" in around 1950. The chances of returning from emigration depend very much on age. If this age cohort is taken as a recruitment basis for possible return, it may presumably be taken as a basis that some twenty-five to thirty per cent of émigrés in this age group returned[51]. This seems, nevertheless, a considerable proportion if one bears in mind the circumstances and frequently the family consequences connected at the time with emigration, and the extent to which the émigrés had in the meantime become integrated in America. Indubitably, more intensive recruitment could have induced more sociological émigrés to return, and many were disappointed not to be called. On the whole, however, the sociological émigrés were to a remarkable extent prepared to resume contacts after the war and to contribute to the reconstruction of the social sciences. This is true even of those who abandoned the idea of return and remained gratefully linked with a country that had welcomed them and saved them from certain ruin.

For the younger émigré generations who left Germany or Austria as children or young people return was much less likely, and only a very few in these age groups came back. They had had an American academic education, and even if they still remained in close touch with the German-speaking cultural tradition, they were nevertheless fully integrated in America, academically and socially.

Many returning émigrés, especially those who did not return till after 1955, again felt themselves marginalized after return. They had hoped for greater chances of influence, and experienced the Federal German post-war society now created as strange. After twenty-five to thirty years in emigration the Federal Republic or Austria was no longer their country.

The sociological emigration was on the whole more of a loss for the countries of origin than a gain to the host countries. While the literature lays greater emphasis on the gains to the host countries, mainly the United States[52], this reflects not so much the actual effects, but rather the lack of interest in emigration and its consequences in Germany.

Today, very complex international sociological communication networks have been set up, but are largely independent of the sociological emigration; the internationalization of the social sciences has made national formations take second place.

FOOTNOTES

1. Cf. Norman Bentwich, The Rescue and Achievement of Refugee Scholars and Scientists 1933-1952, The Hague 1953; id., The Refugees from Germany April 1933 - December 1935, London 1936; Edward Y. Hartshorne, The German Universities and National Socialism, Cambridge, 1937; Stephen Duggan and Betty Drury, The Rescue of Science and Learning, New York 1948; Maurice R. Davie, Refugees in America, New York 1947; Kurt R. Grossmann, Emigration. Geschichte der Hitler-Flüchtilinge 1933-1945, Frankfurt 1969; Laura Fermi, Illustrious Immigrants, 2. ed. Chicago and London 1971; Louise W. Holborn, Deutsche Wissenschaften in den Verinigten Staaten in den Jahren nach 1933; in: Jahrbuch für Amerika-Studien, Vol. 10, 1965; David Earl Sutherland, On the Migration of Sociological Structures, 1933-1941, in: Current Sociology, Year 22, 1974; Wolfgang Frühwald and Wolfgang Schieder (eds.), Leben im Exil: Probleme der Integration deutsche Flüchtlinge im Ausland 1933-1945, Hamburg 1981.

2. Schumpeter accepted a call to Havard in 1932, but was reluctant to leave Germany and in deep depression. Fritz Karl Mann told me in 1976 about Schumpeter's departure from the Cologne-Bonn circle of sociologists, and the then prevailing pessimistic view of political developments. Schumpeter gave his last talk to the circle on the theme "The sociology of foreign politics"; it remained unpublished.

3. Lazarsfeld went first to America in Autumn 1933 on a Rockefeller scholarship, returning briefly to Vienna in 1935 before emigrating definitively. After the suppression of the socialist camp in 1934, relations and friends of Lazarsfeld had been arrested and he himself could for political reasons no longer stay in Austria. On this cf. Paul Neurath, Paul Lazarsfeld 1901-1976, unpublished manuscript, Vienna 1980. Marie Jahoda, who after Lazarsfeld took over the leadership of the Research Centre for Economic Psychology, was imprisoned for nine months in 1936 for illegally working for the socialists, and expelled in 1937; cf. Mathias Greffrath, Die Zerstörung einer Zukunft, Reinbek 1979, Gespräch mit Marie Jahoda, p. 124 ff; she also reports that Lazarsfeld had already been beaten up by Nazi youth groups in Vienna in 1933, p.110.

4. The contribution from the social scientists born in Hungary is remarkable. Besides Georg Lukács and Karl Mannheim the following deserve special mention: Arnold Hauser, who even in Britain wrote all his manuscripts in German; Karl Polanyi, who

was born in Vienna but grew up in Budapest; Ernst Manheim. They all left Hungary around 1920 in connection with the establishment of the Horthy regime and the overthrow of the Hungarian Soviet Republic. On this cf. Arnold Hauser, Im Gespräch mit Georg Lukács, Munich 1978.

5. Cf. Siegmund Kaznelson (ed.), Juden im deutschen Kulturbereich, 2nd ed. Berlin 1959; in which Ernst Noam, Volkswirtschaft und Soziologie.

6. Economics was of particular importance for the development of the social sciences because it was in its context that sociology could grow most strongly in the universities. The linkage between economic science, social policy, economic history and social analysis offered the best possibility of growth in the pre-war period. The supplanting of historicism was begun by the Vienna school, whose theory of marginal utility was a starting point for a theoretical renewal of economics. Meanwhile in Germany developments lagged behind; it was not until the twenties that a theoretical renewal began here too. Among the theoreticians who did not emigrate were notably A. Spiethoff, H.v. Stackelberg, E.v. Beckenrath, O. v. Zwiedineck, E. Preiser, E. Schneider. With the development of the new economics the connection with the social sciences was broken, though this was not true for the transitional generation. Thus, such a person as Schumpeter can still be assigned both to economics and to sociology and political science; the same is true of F.K. Mann, A. Löwe, F.v. Hayek, A. Rüstow, W. Röpke, E. Preiser, H. Sultan. In view of the low level of theoretical development the economists from Germany had much less influence in emigration than the Austrians, while their departure from Germany contributed to the delaying of theoretical renewal until after the Second World War.

7. On this cf. the numerous autobiographical writings, in particular the interviews published by Mathias Greffrath entitled "Die Zerstörung einer Zukunft" Reinbek 1979; the interview with Hannah Arendt by Günter Gaus, Zur Person, Munich 1964; also Leo Lowenthal, Mitmachen wollte ich nie - Ein autobiographisches Gespräch mit Helmut Dubiel, Frankfurt 1980; the articles by Reinhard Bendix, Ernst Manheim and K.H. Wolff in this volume; René König, Leben im Widerspruch, Munich 1980; Rudolf Heberle, Soziologische Lehr- und Wanderjahre and Theodor W. Adorno, Wissenschaftliche Erfahrungen in Amerika, in: Wolf Lepenies (ed.), Geschichte der Soziologie, Frankfurt 1981; Paul F. Lazarsfeld, An Episode in the History of Social Research: A Memoir, in: Donald Fleming and Bernard Bailyn

(eds) The Intellectual Migration, Cambridge 1969; Nico Stehr, Ein Gespräch mit Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, 28th year 1976, p. 796-807; Jürgen Habermas, Silvia Bovenschen et al, Gespräche mit Herbert Marcuse, Frankfurt 1978.

8. As examples we shall briefly outline a few life stories, as representatives of those that can no longer be traced. Carl Dreyfuss was born in Frankfurt in 1898, the son of a manufacturer. In 1933 he published an interesting study on the occupation and ideology of white collar workers, then emigrated to Britain where his attemps to find an academic job failed. He emigrated to Argentina, where he managed a pottery factory. After the war he went through reparation proceedings with the help of Theodor Adorno, with whom he had been in close touch in Frankfurt before 1933. In 1963 he returned to Germany ill, and again tried to take up literary and academic work. He was unsuccessful, and died of heart attack in Munich in 1969. (I owe these indications to research by Werner Mangold).

Walter B. Simon was born in 1918 in Vienna and took his Abitur in 1936. To prepare for emigration, he took hotel management courses. He left Vienna eleven weeks after the incursion of the Germans and went to Denmark. Four weeks later he secured a forty-eight hour transit visa for Britain, in order to go to Ireland. The expulsion initially decreed there was raised, so that he was able to work there until 1940 as an under-waiter. In 1940 he obtained a U.S. visa and worked in Cleveland and Seattle as a labourer. Following army service from 1946 to 1950 he began his studies, worked in market and opinion research and was able after taking a doctorate in 1957 to embark on an academic career (personal communication).

Käthe Leichter was born in Vienna in 1958, graduated from Heidelberg in 1918 and was active in educational and women's work in the left-wing of the Austrian social democrats. She did considerable sociological statistical work on the position of women, and after the February fighting in 1934 went underground. In May 1938 she was arrested by the Gestapo, sent to the Ravensbrück concentration camp in 1940, and in February 1942 was murdered in a railway carriage near Magdeburg in the course of gassing expreriments. (cf. Biographisches Handbuch der deutschsprachigen Emigration nach 1933, Vol. I, Munich, New York 1980, p.427).

9. Cf. inter alios Alfred J. Marrow, Kurt Lewin - Leben und Werk,

Stuttgart 1977; Jean Matter Mandler and George Mandler, The Diaspora of Experimental Psychology; Herbert Feigl. The Wiener Kreis in America, both in: D. Fleming and B. Bailyn, op cit; Albert Wellek, Der Einfluss der deutschen Emigration auf die Entwicklung der nordamerikanischen Psychologie, in: Jahrbuch für Amerika-Studien. Vol. 10 1965.

10. On the significance of psychoanalysts' emigration cf. Marie Jahoda, The Migration of Psychoanalysis: Its Impact on American Psychology, in: D. Fleming and B. Bailyn, op. cit.; Laura Fermi op. cit. chapter VI; H. Stuart Hughes, The Sea Change, New York 1975, Chapter 5.

11. Cf. inter alios Helmut Dubiel, Wissenschaftsorganisation und politische Erfahrung, Frankfurt 1978; Jürgen Habermas (ed.), Antworten auf Herbert Marcuse, Frankfurt 1968; Die Linke antwortet Jürgen Habermas, Frankfurt 1968.

12. On this cf. Carsten Klingemann's article in this volume, also Hans Freyer, Revolution von rechts, Jena 1931; id., Gegenwartsaufgaben der deutschen Soziologie, Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft, Vol. 95 (1935); Heinz Maus, Bericht über die deutsche Soziologie 1933 bis 1945, in: Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, 11th year (1951).

13. Among the émigrés were Karl and Charlotte Bühler, Kurt Lewin and William Stern. On the importance of psychology for the further development of the methods of empirical social research, see also Susanne Petra Schad, Empirical Social Research in Weimar Germany, Paris - The Hague 1972.

14. Cf. also Hans Zeisel's article in this volume, also Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Introduction to the new 1960 edition, in: Marie Jahoda, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Hans Zeisel, Die Arbeitslosen von Marienthal, 2nd ed. Allensbach 1960; id. Eine Episode in der Geschichte der empirischen Sozialforschung in: Talcott Parsons, Edward Shils, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Soziologie - autobiographisch, Stuttgart 1975.

15. Also worthy of mention is J. Nothaas, Sozialer Auf- und Abstieg im deutschen Volk, in: Kölner Vierteljahrshefte für Soziologie, 1X year (1930/31).

16. On the history of empirical social research in Germany cf. Anthony Oberschall, Empirical Social Research in Germany 1848-1914, Paris and The Hague 1965, Susanne Petra Schad, Empirical

Social Research in Weimar Germany, op. cit., who does not consider the very last years of the Weimar Republic, work done before 1933 that remained unpublished, nor developments in Vienna, so that she arrives at a negative verdict. After 1945 Adorno, Plessner and Schelsky treated empirical social research with deep ambivalence; while they encouraged empirical work, they simultaneously stressed the primacy of theory. On this cf. M. Rainer Lepsius, Die Entwicklung der Soziologie nach dem zweiten Weltkrieg 1945-1967, in: Günther Lüschen (ed.), Deutsche Soziologie seit 1945, Opladen 1979, p. 41f.

17. In the debate on the middle classes and white collar workers, begun by Emil Lederer in 1912, the constant efforts at the revision and the rehabilitation of Marx's class theory find their expression. White-collar research around 1930 has therefore both a theoretical and empirical aspect; both serve to increase the reality content of sociological structural analysis in the transition from an industrial society to a service society. Hans Speier's studies were not published until 1977, in Germany with the title: Die Angestellten vor dem Nationalsozialismus; and Emil Lederer's works made available, through an initiative by Jürgen Kocka, in a selection entitled Kapitalismus, Klassenstruktur und Probleme der Demokratie in Deutschland 1910 to 1940, both published by Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen. As against this, C. Wright Mills' book White Collar, New York 1951, was translated into German in 1955, attracted great attention and opened up the white collar debate in post-war Germany. Mills' book was, however, written under the influence of German white-collar sociology of the thirties, which no longer continued in Germany. This is a good example of the break in tradition, which is not even taken notice of.

18. Cf. Goetz Briefs, Betriebssoziologie, in: Alfred Vierkandt (ed.), Handwörterbuch der Soziologie, Stuttgart 1931; id. Betriebsführung und Betriebsleben in der Industrie, Stuttgart 1934. Also: Hendrik de Man, Der Kampf um die Arbeitsfreude, Jena 1927. Even immediately after the First World War, Willy Hellpach had encouraged industrial sociology studies in the Institut für Sozialpsychologie at the Karlsruhe TH which he had refounded: Richard Lang and Willy Hellpach, Gruppenfabrikation, Berlin 1922 and Eugen Rosenstock, Werkstattaussiedlung, Berlin 1922. Cf. also Burkart Lutz and Gert Schmidt, Industriesoziologie, in: R. König (ed.) Handbuch der empirischen Sozialforschung 2nd ed., Vol. 8, Stuttgart 1977.

19. Theodor Geiger, Panik im Mittelstand, in: Die Arbeit, 7th year

1930; id., Kritik der Verbürgerlichung in: Die Arbeit, 8th year, 1931; id., Die Mittelstände im Zeichen des Nationalsozialismus, in: id., Die soziale Schichtung des deutschen Volkes, Stuttgart 1932; Svend Riemer, Zur Soziologie des Nationalsozialismus, in: Die Arbeit, 9th year, 1932. Also the study by Hans Speier already mentioned; Rudolf Heberle's studies Landbevölkerung und Nationalsozialismus, completed in 1936, which could not appear in full and in German until 1963; also the studies on authority and family of the Institut für Sozialforschung, which were published in Paris in 1936, alredy in emigration.

20. Lisbeth Franzen-Hellersberg, Die jugendliche Arbeiterin, Tübingen 1932; Hildegard Hetzer, Kindheit und Armut, Leipzig 1929; Paul F. Lazarsfeld (ed.), Jugend und Beruf, Jena 1931; Adolf Busemann, Handbuch der jugendlichen Milieukunde, Halle 1932. Cf. also Leopold Rosenmayr, Geschichte der Jugendforschung in Österreich 1914-1931, Vienna 1962.

21. Helmut Schelskey, Ortbestimmung der deutschen Soziologie, Düsseldorf 1959, p. 36f., id. Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der bundesdeutschen Soziologie, reprinted in: id. Rückblicke eines "Anti-Soziologen", Opladen 1981, p. 15ff.

22. On the influence of the sociological emigration in the US, the following publications deserve particular mention: Rex Crawford (ed.), The Cultural Migration, Philadelphia 1953 (with articles by Franz Neumann and Paul Tillich); Helge Pross, Die deutsche Akademische Emigration nach den Vereinigten Staaten 1933-1941, Berlin 1955; Svend Riemer, Die Emigration der deutschen Soziologen nach den Vereinigten Staaten, in: Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, 11th year (1959); Radio Bremen, Auszug des Geistes, Bremen 1962; Donald Fleming and Bernard Bailyn (ed.), The Intellectual Migration, Europe and America, 1930-1960, Cambridge 1969; Laura Fermi, Illustrious Immigrants, The intellectual Migration from Europe, 1930-1941, Chicago and London 1971[2]; Robert Boyers (ed.) The Legacy of the German Refugee Intellectuals, New York 1972; Joachim Radkau, Die deutsche Emigration in den USA, ihr Einfluss auf die amerikanische Europapolitik 1933-1945. Düsseldorf 1971; H. Stuart Hughes, The Sea Change. The Migration of Social Thought 1930-1965, New York 1975; Herbert Marcuse, Der Einfluss der deutschen Emigration auf das amerikanische Geistesleben: Philosophie and Soziologie, in Jahrbuch für Amerika-Studien,

Vol. 10, 1965; Kurt Lang, The critical functions of empirical communication research: observations on German-American influences, in: Media, Culture and Society, 1st year, 1979.

23. Alvin Johnson played a remarkable role for the sociological émigrés by securing for many their first job giving them the scholars' entry permit and avoiding the quota restrictions on immigrants. Cf. his autobiography Pioneer's Progress, New York 1952.

24. On the response to Norbert Elias's work, see: Johan Goudsblom, Aufnahme und Kritik der Arbeiten von Norbert Elias in England, Deutschland, den Niederlanden und Frankreich and Karl-Siegbert Rehberg, Form und Prozess. Zu den katalysatorischen Wirkungschancen einer Soziologie aus dem Exil: Norbert Elias, both in: Peter Gleichmann, Johan Goudsblom and Hermann Dorte (eds), Materialien zu Norbert Elias' Zivilisationstherorie, Frankfurt 1977.

25. The émigrés' second flight from France after 1940 meant that after the war there were hardly any people from their circle to mediate between the social sciences in the Federal Republic and France. The exceptional position of Alfred Grosser and Joseph Rovan emphasized this lack. By contrast, the émigrés' role as mediators between the US and the Federal Republic cannot be overestimated.

26. On emigration to the European countries in general see René König, Die Situation der emigrierten deutschen Soziologen in Europa, Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, 11th year, 1959, reprinted in expanded form in: Wolf Lepenies (ed.), Geschichte der Soziologie, Frankfurt 1981.

27. Only the American university system had the size and receptivity to be able to offer many émigrés full-time academic work. In South America in particular, the émigrés seem overwhelmingly to have failed to find academic positions; there are hardly any members of the sociological emigration among them, not even in the youngest generation. Cf. for instance, the life story of Carl Dreyfuss, sketched above (footnote 8).

28. On this cf. Fritz Neumark's article in this volume.

29. Thus also Helge Pross: "It is a hazardous undertaking to seek to evaluate the emigration of German academic intellectuals to the United States as a whole from the viewpoint of success and failure. It was, after all, not an organized movement, but consisted of individuals with the most diverse individual fates." Die Deutsche Akademische Emigration nach den Vereinigten Staaten 1933-1941, Berlin 1955, p.68.

30. The influence of the physicists, especially the atomic physicists, is well documented: cf. inter al. Charles Weiner, A New Site for the Seminar: The Refugees and American Physics in the Thirties, in: Donald Fleming and Bernard Bailyn, The Intellectual Migration, Cambridge 1969; Laura Fermi, Illustrious Immigrants, Chicago 1971^2, Chapter VII. For art history there was special receptivity because of the interest in expert ordering and guidance of the major art collections built up through private purchasing, and because of the fact that art history was still not an established subject at American universities. On this cf. Erwin Panofsky, The History of Art, in: Rex Crawford (ed.), op. cit., Colin Eisler, Kunstgeschichte American Style: A Study in Migration, in D. Fleming and B. Bailyn, op.cit. Laura Fermi, op. cit. p. 247ff. And for art history and archeology the Institute for Advanced Study founded in Princeton in 1933 played a central role in securing and placing leading German émigrés. It acted innovatively in a specifically classifiable sense. However, the Institute had no social science department, and therefore remained without significance for the social sciences.

31. On this cf. the article by Benita Luckmann in this volume. G. Colm was from 1939 on economic and financial policy adviser to the American Government in the Bureau of the Budget and in the National Planning Association in Washington. He had a decisive share in the planning and implementation of the 1948 currency reform in the three Western Zones. Hans Speier was in the service of the American Government from 1942 to 1947, and from 1948 to 1960 led the sociological department of the Rand Corporation. Schütz's influence is connected with the interest in phenomenology, which did not start until the sixties, cf. H. Wagner's article in this voulume. Leo Strauss gained greater influence after his move to Chicago in 1949. Hannah Arendt did not come till 1967, when her influence was already established. Max Wertheimer taught from 1934 to 1943 at the New School; his influence as the major figure of Gestalt psychology was already established before the emigration through translations. The importance of the New School lies

primarily in its function as a reception and assistance institution for hundreds of émigrés, not so much in the effects it had as an institute on the American social sciences, although the journal the New School issued, Social Research, was, besides the Review of Politics, the most important publication presenting the sociological émigrés. Cf. also J. Radkau, op. cit., p.35ff; Henry Pachter, A Memoir, in: R. Boyers, op. cit. p. 33ff.; Walter Sprondel, Erzwungene Diffusion, Die "University in Exile" und Aspekte ihrer Wirkung, in: Wolf Lepenies (ed.) op. cit.

32. on this cf. J. Coleman's article in this volume and Alfons Söllner, Franz L. Neumann - Skizzen zu einer intellektuellen und politischen Biographie in: Franz L. Neumann, Wirtschaft, Staat, Demokratie, Aufsätze 1930-1954, ed. by A. Söllner, Frankfurt/M 1978. The successor to Neumann, who died in 1954, was Otto Kirchheimer until his death in 1965. Neumann, Kirchheimer and Herbert Marcuse, who had met in New York through the Institute für Sozialforschung, worked from 1942 onwards in the Office for Strategic Studies in Washington, which among other things handled plans for the treatment of Germany after the capitulation. Until his death Neumann was directly interested in policy towards Germany, and called, with Kirchheimer, for the foundation of the Free University of Berlin and the re-establishment of the Deutsche Hochschule für Politik in Berlin.

33. Th. W. Adorno, Scientific Experience of a European Scholar in America, in: D. Fleming and B. Bailyn, op. cit.; cf. Martin Jay, Dialektische Phantasie, Frankfurt 1976; Helmut Dubiel, Wissenschaftsorganisation und politische Erfahrung, Frankfurt 1978; Leo Löwenthal, Mitmachen wollte ich nie, ein autobiographisches Gespräch mit Helmut Dubiel, Frankfurt 1980; Jürgen Habermas, Die Frankfurter Schule in New York in: id., Philosophisch-politische Profile, 3rd enlarged edition, Frankfurt 1981.

34. Of the original members of the Institute, the following remained in America and won academic importance without further connection with the Institute or the "Frankfurt School": Erich Fromm, Otto Kirchheimer, Franz Neumann, Karl August Wittfogel. Leo Löwenthal and Herbert Marcuse too managed to establish themselves independently in America. It was not until the re-establishment of the Institute in Frankfurt and the collaborative work of Horkheimer and Adorno after the war that the academic setting was created which in the seventies made the "Frankfurt School" a byword in America too, a circumstance to which Jürgen Habermas contributed notably.

35. Cf. the annexed survey.

36. Account should also be taken here of the works already mentioned on National Socialism that were either still published in Germany or carried out in Germany before the emigration; cf. note 19. Interestingly, the authors of these works also emigrated. In this connection mention should also be made of : Karl Popper, The Open Society and its Enemics (1944), Princeton 1950 (German 1957, 1958) and Theodore Geiger, Demokratie ohne Dogma (1950), Munich 1963.

37. The most important exception is Peter C. Ludz, who turned to the analysis of the GDR and thence also became one of the early critics of the totalitarianism concept. Noteworthy also is the early work by Karl D. Bracher on the emergence of National Socialism and its seizure of power, which stressed sociological approaches. The recent controversy between a structural and a Hitler-centred perspective in research on National Socialism is significantly carried on exclusively by historians; on this cf. most recently Gerhard Hirschfeld and Lothar Kettenacker (eds.), Der "Führerstaat": Mythos und Realität, Studien zur Struktur und Politik des Dritten Reiches, Stuttgart 1981, particularly the two articles by Hans Mommsen and Klaus Hilderbrand.

38. Cf. Walter Eucken, Die Grundlagen der Nationalökonomie, Jena 1940, and the work of Franz Böhm, Leonhard Miksch, Heinrich von Stackelberg and Alfred Müller-Armack. To this group there belong two émigrés: Gottfried Haberler and Friedrich Lutz. In this connection A. Rüstow's study, Das Versagen des Wirtschaftsliberalismus, Godesberg 1950 (initially Istanbul 1945) deserves special mention.

39. L. v. Mises wrote a manuscript in Geneva in 1938/39 entitled "Vom Wesen und Werden des Nationalismus", which was published only posthumously in 1978, under the title "Im Namen des Staates oder die Gefahren des Kollekitvismus". Cf. also L. v. Mises, Human Action, New Haven 1949; John R. Hicks, The Hayek-Group, in: Critical Essays in Monetary Theory, Oxford 1967; Fritz Machlup (ed.), Essays on Hayek, London 1977 (German Tübingen 1977).

40. We shall mention only: R. Christie and M. Jahoda (ed.), Studies in the Scope and Method of "The Authoritarian Personality", Glencoe 1954; M. Rokeach, The Open and the C sed Mind, New York 1960 and the cultural criticism of D. Riesman, The Lonely Crowd, New Haven 1950.

41. On this cf., for instance: Alfred Vierkandt (ed), Handwörterbuch

der Soziologie, Stuttgart 1931; Theodor Geiger, Die Masse und ihre Aktion, Stuttgart 1926.

42. Schumpeter is in the tradition of Max Weber and Robert Michels, who founded the sociological analysis of democracy even before the First World War. Schumpeter, Weber and Michels were fundamental to S.M. Lipset's political sociology, which gained great influence both in America and in the Federal Republic in the sixties (cf. S.M. Lipset, Political Man, New York 1960, German translation 1962, also S.M. Lipset, M. Trow J.S. Coleman, Union Democracy, 1956). In this connection reference should be made also to the importance of the classical studies by P.F. Lazarsfeld (The People's Choice, 1949 and Voting, 1954) for modern electoral research. Another part of the émigrés' contribution to the development of political sociology is the book by Rudolf Heberle, Social Movements, New York 1951 (German title: Hauptprobleme der politischen Soziologie, Stuttgart 1967).

43. On this cf. in particular Peter Chr. Ludz, Entwurf einer soziologischen Theorie totalitär verfasster Gesellschaften, in: id., Studien und Materialien zur Soziolgie der DDR, Sonderheft 8 der Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Cologne and Opladen 1964. In his later work P.C. Ludz sought step by step to flesh out the programme set out there, dealing also with the particular methodological and theoretical difficulties of a structural comparison between democratically and totalitarianly constituted societies.

44. Cf. R. Bendix, Max Weber, An Intellectual Portait, Garden City 1960; Lewis Coser, The Function of Social Conflict, Glencoe 1956; Kurt H. Wolff, The Sociology of Georg Simmel, Glencoe 1950. It is not possible here to give a systematic description of the process of diffusion of classical German sociology in the United States. That it began before the emigration and would have gone further even without it is indisputable; so is the fact that the emigration gave it a breadth that could not otherwise have been expected. To be sure, even despite the emigration numerous misunderstandings and one-sided perceptions arose in the response process, to be removed only gradually in recent years. Cf. for instance, on the importance of Max Weber, Günther Roth and Reinhard Bendix, Max Webers Einfluss auf die amerikanische Soziologie, in: Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, 11th year, 1959.

45. On this cf. the many autobiographical references, for instance

those by Reinhard Bendix and Ernst Manheim in this volume; likewise Karl August Wittfogel in M. Greffrath, op. cit. Henry Pachter in: Robert Boyers, op.cit. On the conservative tendencies in emigration, see Joachim Radkau, op. cit. Chapter V.

46. We shall mention only Louis Wirth, Franz Boas, Francis Lieber. Carl Joachim Friedrich is another influential immigrant in the US before the forced emigration. Mention should also be made of the early contacts between Park and Simmel. The two most important founders of political science in America, Merriam and Lasswell, studied in Germany, as did such sociologists as A. Small, R.E. Park, C. Ellwood, T. Parsons and H. Becker.

47. On this cf. J. Radkau, op. cit. The work of Franz Neumann, Sigmund Neumann, Otto Kirchheimer and Herbert Marcuse in the Office of Strategic Services and later in the State Department has not yet been thoroughly studied.

48. Cf. M.R. Lepsius, op. cit. and Hans-Joachim Arndt, Die Besiegten von 1945, Berlin 1978, Hans Kastendick, Die Entwicklung der westdeutschen Politkwissenschaft, Frankfurt 1977.

49. This estimate is based on the indications in the annex. It is also noteworthy that all the communist-oriented émigrés went to the Soviet-occupied zone and all the social-democratic ones to the Western zone. There is a clear sorting out of the socialist and communist political and intellectual elites that had existed side by side before 1933, with the result that in the Western zones, later the Federal Republic, scarecely any intellectually significant communists settled. This also contributed to the intellectual unimportance of communism in the Federal Republic. On this cf. the details in: Biographisches Handbuch der deutschsprachigen Emigration nach 1933, Vol. I: Politik, Wirtschaft, Öffentliches Leben, ed. under the guidance of Werner Röder and Herbert A. Strauss, Munich 1980.

50. For instance, Leopold von Wiese tried in 1949 to interest Theodor Geiger in the Chair of Sociology in Cologne. But in the circumstances of the time, Geiger could not in his family's interests decide on a return. In 1950 Geiger then wrote to von Wiese: "I have more than once regretted in recent months that at the lunch in Oslo I left it to my wife to respond to your feelers regarding Cologne with a flat 'no'." (Letter of 8.5.1950, Akten der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Soziologie).

51. Calculated according to indications in the annexed survey.

52. Thus, for instance, H. Stuart Hughes writes: "In the perspective of the 1970's, the migration to the United States of European intellectuals fleeing fascist tyranny has finally become visible as the most important cultural event - or series of events - of the second quarter of the twentieth century" op. cit., p. 1.

ANNEX

List of Social Scientists who emigrated.

The following lists of names of émigré social scientists are intended to give an impression of the extent and structure of the emigration and of its scholarly potential, even in the younger generations who no longer finished their education in Germany or Austria. They are confined to a very few details, which even laborious research did not yield for all of them. The details are confined to: date and place of birth, date and place of death; date and place of doctorate; last job before emigration; year and country of emigration; last position after emigration.

More detailed biographical and bibliographical details will be given for the majority of those listed here in volume II, Science, of the Biographical Handbook on German-speaking post-1933 Emigrés, which should come out in 1982 or 1983. A few have already been listed in: Biographisches Handbuch der deutschsprachigen Emigration nach 1933, Vol. I; Politik, Wirtschaft, Öffentliches Leben, compiled under the supervision of Werner Röder and Herbert A. Strauss, Munich 1980. I am grateful to the editors of the Handbook for valuable indications and references. Reference should also be made to the following sources: W. Bernsdorf and H. Knospe, Internationales Soziologenlexikon, Vol. I, 2nd ed., Stuttgart 1980; W. Sternfeld, E. Tiedemann, Deutsche Exil-Literatur 1933-1945, eine Bio-Bibliographie, Heidelberg 1970; G. Stourzh, Bibliographie der deutschsprachigen Emigration in den Vereinigten Staaten, 1933-1963: Geschichte und Politische Wissenschaft, Jahrbuch für Amerikastudien, Vol. 10, 1965 and Vol. 11, 1965, as well as to the relevant academic yearbooks.

The criteria underlying the delimitation were as follows: those included produced publications, before or after emigration, which in modern terms can be assigned to the disciplines of

sociology and political science, and they emigrated from Germany or Austria in connection with political and racial discrimination. Those still children or youths at the time of emigration are included, but not children born to émigrés. In individual cases there are always problematic decisions of a subjective character. This is particularly true of the older émigré, since in the twenties neither sociology or even political science were institutionally delimited disciplines. As a rule, philosophers and historians are not included, and psychologists, jurists and economists only if they have published work falling within the social sciences in the narrower sense. The incompleteness of the lists of names is to be explained both by the incompleteness of studies on the émigrés and by the delimitation r les. Among those not listed are, for instance: H.G. Adler, born in Prague 1910, Ph D, concentration camps from 1941 to 1945, because he did not emigrate, to Britain, until 1947, or Hans Baerwald, born in Tokyo in 1927, who emigrated to the US in 1940 and is professor of political science at the University of California in Los Angeles, because he did not emigrate from Germany, though he shared the fate of his father, who was industrial representative of a German firm in Japan and could no longer return to Germany after 1933. Another borderline case is Georg Lukács, who finally emigrated from Berlin in 1933, to the Soviet Union, but had already become a collaborator of the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute in Moscow in 1930. Emil Gumbel, born in Munich in 1891, Privatdozent and extraordinary professor of statistics in Heidelberg, who had his teaching licence taken away for political reasons in 1932 and emigrated to the US via France, had published on political assasination in 1922, but does not therefore yet count towards the sociological emigration.

These examples are intended to make clear the delimitation problem. It is to be hoped that the publication of this list will help to bring other names of émigrés in the social science field out into the open.

SOCIOLOGY

Adler, Franz: 1908 Vienna; Dr. jur. Vienna 1933; USA Ph.D, U of Wisconsin 1953; Prof. California State U. Los Angeles.

Adorno, Theodor W.: 1903 Frankfurt - 1969 Brig/Wallis; Dr. phil. Frankfurt 1924, Habilitation Frankfurt 1931; 1934 Great Britain, 1938 USA; Institut für Sozialforschung New York and Los Angeles; 1949 return to Germany, Prof. U. Frankfurt.

Back, Kurt Wolfgang: 1919 Vienna; 1938 USA; Ph.D. Massachusetts Institute of Technology 1949; Prof. of Sociology and Psychology Duke U. Durham.

Baerwald, Friedrich, 1900 Frankfurt, Dr.jur. Freiburg 1923, senior official in government labour office in Berlin; 1935 USA; Professor of Economics Fordham U., New York.

Baldus, Herbert, 1899 Wiesbaden - 1970; Dr. phil. Berlin 1932; 1932 Brazil; Prof. of Ethnology at Escola de Sociologia e Politica de São Paulo, Brazil.

Baldamus, Wilhelm: 1908 Berlin; Dr. rer. pol. Frankfurt 1932; 1937 Great Britain; Prof. Birmingham U. Visiting Prof. Hannover TH 1963/64.

Baschwitz, Kurt: 1886 Offenburg; 1968 Amsterdam; Dr. oec. publ. Munich 1908; Chief editor with Association of German Newspaper Publishers in Berlin; 1933 Netherlands; Prof. Newspaper Science, U. Amsterdam since 1952.

Bash, Harry H. (Basch, Heinz Helmut): 1926 Berlin; 1938 USA; Ph.D. U. of Pennsylvania 1969; Prof. U. of Missouri, St. Louis.

Behrendt, Richard Fritz: 1908 Gleiwitz - 1972 Basel; Dr. phil. Basel 1932; 1935 Panama, 1941 USA; 1953 Prof. U. Bern; 1965 return to Germany, Prof. FU Berlin.

Bendix, Reinhard: 1916 Berlin, 1938 USA; Ph.D. U. of Chicago 1947; Prof. U. of California, Berkeley.

Bergel, Egon E: 1894; Dr. jur. Vienna 1918; lawyer in Vienna; 1938 USA; Ph.D. Harvard 1942; Prof. Long Island U.

Berger, Ida: 1910 Berlin; 1933 Frankreich; Dr. phil. Paris, freelance academic work in Paris.

Bettelheim,Bruno: 1903 Vienna; Dr. phil. Vienna 1938; 1939 USA; Prof. of Education U. Chicago.

Blau, Peter: 1918 Vienna; School leaving Cert. 1937 Vienna; 1938 Czechoslovakia, France, 1939 USA; Ph.D. Columbia U. 1952;

Prof. Columbia U. New York.

Blaukopf, Kurt: 1914 Czernowitz (now Chernovtsy); State Examination in Law Vienna 1937; 1939 France; 1940 Palestine; 1947 return to Austria, Professor of Music Sociology, Hochschule für Musik, Vienna.

Brauer, Theodor: 1880 Kleve - 1942 St. Paul; Dr. phil. Bonn 1919; Prof. of Social Policy U. Cologne and Director of Christian Trade Union School Königswinter; 1933 USA; Prof. College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minn.

Briefs, Götz: 1889 Eschweiler - 1974 Rome; Dr. phil. Freiburg 1911, Habilitation 1913; 1928 Prof. of Economic Theory and Industrial Sociology, Berlin TH; 1934 USA; Prof. Wirtschafts-wissenschaft, Georgetown U Washington.

Buber, Martin: 1878 Vienna - 1965 Jerusalem; Dr. phil. Vienna 1904, honorary professor of Jewish Religion and Ethics U. Frankfurt 1924-1933; 1938 Prof. of Social Philosophy and General Sociology, Hebrew University, Jerusalem.

Bunzel, Joseph H.:1907 Graz - 1975; Dr. jur. Vienna 1932; Prof. State University of New York, Buffalo.

Cahnmann, Werner: 1902 Munich - 1980 New York; Dr. oec. publ. Munich; syndic of the Bavarian section of the Central Association of German Citizens of the Jewish Faith; 1940 USA; Prof. Rutgers U. New Brunswick.

Carlebach, Julius: 1922 Hamburg; 1938 USA; Ph.D. Cambridge; Reader U of Sussex, Brighton.

Cohn, Werner: 1926 Berlin 1938 USA; Ph.D. New School for Social Research New York 1956; Prof. U. of British Columbia, Vancouver.

Colm, Gerhard: 1897 Hannover - 1968 Washington; Dr. rer. pol. Freiburg 1921; Privatdozent Kiel 1927, extraordinary Prof. Economics U. Kiel; 1933 USA; Prof. Economics New School for Social Research, National Planning Association, Washington.

Conrad Richard: 1917 Castrop; USA; Ph.D. Stanford U.1951; Prof. Drexel U. Wayne.

Coser, Lewis: 1913 Berlin; 1933 France, 1941 USA; Ph.D. Columbia U. 1944; Prof. State U of New York, Stony Brook.

Coser, Rose Laub: 1916 Berlin; 1934 France, 1938 USA; Ph.D.

Columbia U. 1957; Prof. State U. of New York, Stony Brook.

Croner, Fritz Simon: 1896 Berlin - 1979 Stockholm; Dr. phil. Heidelberg 1921; Lecturer Hochschule für Politik Berlin 1926-1933, Head of Social Policy Section of German Foremen's Association; 1934 Sweden, Director of the Research Institute of the Employees' and Officials' Central Organization, Lecturer U. Stockholm.

Dichter, Ernest: 1907 Vienna; Dr. phil. Vienna 1934; worked at Research Center for Economic Psychology Vienna; 1937 France, 1938 USA; President Ernest Dichter Creativity Ltd; Prof. Nova U. Fort Lauderdale.

Ditz, Gerhard W.: 1917 Prague; USA; Ph.D. Coumbia U 1955; Prof. Eastern Illinois U. Charleston.

Dreyfuss, Carl: 1898 Frankfurt - 1969 Munich; Dr. phil. Cologne 1923; Business, academic and artistic work in Frankfurt; 1935 Great Britain, 1938 (?) Argentina; business; return to Germany 1963; literary work.

Dobretsberger, Josef: 1903 Linz - 1970 Vienna; Dr. rer. pol. Vienna 1926, Prof. Economic Science Graz 1931 - 1938; 1938 Yugoslavia, Switzerland, 1939 Turkey; Prof. Economics Istanbul; return to Austria 1946, Prof. U. Graz.

Drucker, Peter: 1909 Vienna; Dr. jur. Frankfurt 1931; 1933 Great Britain, 1937 USA; Prof. of Management, New York U.

Eaton, Joseph W. (Wechsler): 1919 Nürnberg; 1934 USA; Ph.D. Columbia U. 1948; Prof. U. of Pittsburgh.

Eberhard, Wolfram: 1909 Potsdam; Dr. phil. Berlin 1933; Head of division at the Grassi Museum of Ethnology Leipzig 1936-37; 1937 Turkey, 1948 USA; Prof. U. of California, Berkeley.

Eckhardt, Ursula von: 1925 Hamburg - 1974 Puerto Rico; 1935 USA; Ph.D. New School for Social Research New York 1953; Prof. Social Sciences, U. of Puerto Rico.

Edelstein, Wolfgang: 1929 Freiburg; Iceland; return to Germany 1954; Dr. phil. 1962; academic member of the Max-Plank Institute for Education Research, Berlin.

Elias, Norbert: 1897 Breslau (now Wrockaw); Dr. phil. Breslau 1924; Assistant to Karl Mannheim U Frankfurt; 1933 France, 1938 Great Britain; Prof. U. Leicester.

Engelmann, Hugh O.: 1917 Vienna; Dr. jur. Vienna 1938; 1939 USA; Ph.D.U of Wisconsin 1953; Prof. Northern Illinois U. DeCalb.

Erikson, Erik Homburger:1902 Frankfurt; Psychoanalytical training in Vienna; 1933 USA; Prof. Human Development, Harvard U. Cambridge.

Erikson, Kai Theodor: 1931 Vienna; 1933 USA; Ph.D. Chicago 1955; Prof. Yale U. New Haven.

Etzioni, Amitai (Falk): 1929 Cologne; Palestine, Ph.D. Berkeley 1958; Prof. Columbia U. New York.

Etzioni-Halevy, Eva, neé Horrowitz: 1929 Vienna, 1939 Italy, 1946 Palestine; Prof. Australian National U. Canberra.

Eversley, David (Eberstadt): 1921 Frankfurt; 1937 Great Bri Ph.D. U. of Birmingham 1960, Reader Demography U. of Sussex, Brighton.

Francis, Emerich: 1906 Gablonz; Dr. phil. Deutsche U. Prague 1930; Assistant German Institute for Foreign Studies Munster; 1939 Great Britain, interned in Canada; Prof. Sociology U. of Notre Dame, South Bend; return to Germany 1958, Prof. U. Munich.

Frank, Andre Gunder: 1927 Berlin; 1933 Switzerland, 1937 France, 1940 Great Britain; free-lance academic writer.

Franzen-Hellersberg, Elisabeth: 1893 Düsseldorf - 1970 Harvard, Mass.; Dr. phil. Heidelberg 1933; Teacher Lessing Academy in Berlin; 1936 USA; Gesell Institute for Human Development, New Haven.

Frenkel-Brunswik, Else: 1908 Lemberg (Lviv); Dr. phil. Wien 1930; Assistant at Psychology Institute Vienna U.; 1938 USA; Institute for Child Welfare, Berkeley.

Friedlaender, Otto: 1897 Berlin - 1954 Stockholm; Dr. rer. pol. 1929; Journalist; 1933 Czechoslovakia, 1938 Norway, 1940 Sweden;

Heberle, Rudolf:1896 Lübeck; Dr. rer. pol. Kiel 1923; Habilitation Kiel 1929, Privatdozent for Sociology U. Kiel; 1937 USA; Prof. Louisiana State U. Baton Rouge.

Heimann, Eduard: 1889 Berlin - 1967 Hamburg; Dr. phil. Heidelberg 1912, Habilitation Cologne 1922, Prof. of Economics and Social Sciences Hamburg 1925-1933; 1933 USA; Prof.Economics, New School for Social Research, New York, emer. Prof. U. Hamburg.

Henssler, Frederick W (Friedrich Wolfgang): 1905 Prenslau; Dr. jur. Erlangen 1934; Syndic of German Housing and Land Bank 1934-1937; 1939 USA; Prof. Wagner College Staten Island, New York.

Hertz, Friedrich Otto: 1878 Vienna - 1964 London; Dr. oec. publ. Munich 1903. Prof. Economic Theory and Sociology Halle 1930 - 1933; 1938 Britain, academic writer London.

Herzog, Herta: 1910 Vienna; Dr. phil. Vienna 1932; Research Centre for Economic Psychology Vienna; 1933 USA; Bureau of Applied Social Research Columbia U New York, Co-owner of advertising Agency.

Hess, Albert: 1909 Pirna; Dr. jur. Leipzig 1934, worked in his father's chemical factory 1933-1937; 1937 Belgium, 1940 France, 1941 USA; Prof. State University of New York,Brockport.

Himmelweit, Hilde: 1918 Berlin; 1935 Great Britain; Ph.D. London 1945; Prof. Social Psychology, London School of Economics, London.

Hinkel, Gisela, neé Mann: 1926 Königsberg (Kaliningrad); 1936 USA; Ph.D. U. of Wisconsin 1951; Prof. Ohio State U. Columbus.

Hirsch, Ernst E: 1902 Friedberg (Hessen); Dr. jur. Giessen 1924, Habilitation Frankfurt 1930; 1933 Turkey; Prof. Istanbul and Ankara 1933-1951; return to Germany 1952; Prof. Commercial Law and Legal Sociology, FU Berlin.

Hirsch, Walter: 1919 Stuttgart; 1933 USA; Ph.D. Northwestern U 1957; Prof. Purdue U. Lafayette.

Hirschman, Albert: 1915 Berlin; 1933 France, 1936 Italy, 1939 Great Britain, 1941 USA; Dr. phil. Trieste 1938; Prof. Political Economy, Harvard U.; Institute of Advanced Studies, Princeton.

Honigsheim, Paul: 1885 Düsseldorf - 1963 East Lansing, Mich.;

Dr. phil. Heidelberg 1914; Head of Volkshochschule Cologne, Prof. Sociology, Philosophy and Social Pedagogy, Cologne; 1933 France, 1936 Panama, 1938 USA; Prof. Sociology and Anthropology, Michigan State U. East Lansing.

Horkheimer, Max: 1895 Stuttgart - 1973 Nürnberg; Dr. phil. Frankfurt 1922, Habilitation 1925; Prof. Social Philosopy Frankfurt 1930-1933, Head of the Institute for Social Research Frankfurt; 1933 Switzerland, 1934 USA; Head of Institute for Social Research New York and Los Angeles; Return to Germany 1949; Prof. Philosophy and Sociology U Frankfurt.

Hoselitz, Bert F. 1913 Vienna; Dr. jur. Vienna 1936; 1938 USA; Prof. Social Sciences, U. of Chicago.

Israel, Joachim: 1920 Karlsruhe; 1938 Sweden; Graduated from Stockholm, Habilitation Stockholm 1956; Prof. U. Lund.

Jacoby, Eduard Georg: 1904 Breslau - 1978 Wellington, New Zealand; Dr. jur. Kiel 1929; Adviser in Prussian Ministry of Trade and Commerce 1931-1933; 1937 Great Britain, 1938 New Zealand; educational activity.

Jahoda, Marie: 1907 Vienna; Dr. phil. Vienna 1933; Economic Psychology research post in Vienna until 1936; 1937 Great Britain, 1945 USA, 1958 Great Britain, Prof. Social Psychology U. of Sussex, Brighton.

Jonassohn, Kurt: 1920 Cologne; Canada; MA McGill 1955; Prof. Sir George Williams U. Montreal.

Jungk, Robert: 1913 Berlin; 1933 France, 1936 Czechoslavakia, 1938 France, 1939 Switzerland; return to Germany; scientific writer.

Kantorowicz, Ernst: 1892 Hannover - 1944 Theresienstadt; Dr. jur. Göttingen 1917; Head of Youth Office and Volkshochschule Kiel 1920 - 1930, Prof.of Civics and Social Science, State Institute for Occupational Education in Frankfurt and Teaching Fellow at the University 1930-33, 1938 Buchenwald concentration camp; 1939 Netherlands; 1943 Theresienstadt concentration camp.

Katona, Georg: 1901 Budapest - 1980 Ann Arbor; Dr. phil. Göttingen 1921; worked on "Frankfuter Zeitung", "Wirtschafts-woche", "Der Volkswirt" until 1933; 1933 USA; Prof. Economics and Psychology, U. of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Keller, Suzanne: 1927 Vienna; 1938 Finland; 1939 USA; Ph.D. Columbia U 1953; Prof. Princeton, U. Princeton.

Kirk, Henry David(Kircheimer): 1918 Düsseldorf; 1934 Great Britain, 1938 USA; Ph.D. Corneill U. 1953; Prof. U. of Waterloo, Ontario.

Klein, Josephine: 1926 Düsseldorf; 1940 Great Britain; Ph.D. Birmingham 1951; Reader Social Psychology U. of Sussex, Brighton.

Klein, Viola: 1908 inna; Dr. phil. Prague 1937; 1938 Great Britain, Ph.D. London 1944; Reader U. Reading.

Kofler, Leo: 1907 Chocimierz (Poland); from 1918 in Vienna, Adviser in the Education Centre for Youth Organization Vienna 1930-34; 1938 Switzerland; Dr. phil. Halle 1947; Prof. Philosophy of History U. Halle 1948-1951; resettled in Federal Republic in 1952, Hon. Prof. Sociology U. Bochum from 1974.

König, René: 1906 Magdeburg; Dr. phil. Berlin 1930; 1936 Switzerland; Habilitation Zürich 1938, AssociateProf. Sociology Zürich 1947, eturn to Germany after 1949, Prof. U. Cologne.

Kraucauer, Siegfried: 1889 Frankfurt - 1966 New York; Dr. Ing.TH Berlin 1915; Sub-editor "Frankfurter Zeitung" 1920-1933; 1933 France, 1941 USA; worked at Bureau of Applied Social Research Columbia U. New York.

Kraft, Julius: 1898 Wunstorf (Hannover) - 1960 New York; Dr. jur. Göttingen 1922, Dr. phil. Göttingen 1925; Privatdozent Sociology Frankfurt 1928-1933; 1933 Holland, 1939 USA; Prof. Philosophy return to Germany 1957, Prof. Sociology U Frankfurt.

Kraus, Herta: 1897 Prague - 1968 Haverford; Dr. rer. pol. Frankfurt 1919; Head of Public Welfare Office of City of Cologne, Lecturer at School of Social Work, Cologne; 1933 USA; Prof. Social Work, Haverford College.

Kuczynski, Jürgen: 1904 Elberfeld; Dr. phil. Erlangen 1925; Economic editor; 1936 Great Britain; Communist Party Official; return to Germany 1945, Prof. Economic History, Humboldt U. Berlin.

Kunkel, John: 1932 Berlin; USA; Ph.D. Michigan 1960; Prof. U. of Western Ontario, London, Ont.

Lachmann, Ludwig: 1906 Berlin; Dr. rer. pol. Berlin 1930; 1933 Great Britain, Lecturer U. Hull, 1949 South Africa; Prof. Economic History, U. Witwatersrandt, South Africa.

Landauer, Carl: 1891 Munich; Dr. phil. Heidelberg 1915; Prof. Handelshochschule Berlin 1926-1933; 1933 Switzerland, Executive member Societé International des Recherches Sociales; 1936 USA, Prof. Economics, U. of California, Berkeley.

Landecker, Werner Siegmund: 1911 Berlin; Dr. jur. Berlin 1936; 1937 USA; Ph.D. Michigan 1947; Prof. U. of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Landsberger, Henry A. 1926 Dresden; 1938 Great Britain, USA; Ph.D. Cornell 1954; Prof. U. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Lang, Gottfried O.: 1919 Oberammergau; 1938 Canada; Ph.D. Cornell 1953; Prof. Social Anthropology U. of Colorado, Boulder.

Lang, Kurt: 1924 Berlin; 1936 USA; Ph.D. Chicago 1953; Prof. State U. of New York, Stony Brook.

Langerhans, Heinz: 1904 Berlin - 1976 Bad Homburg; Dr. phil. Frankfurt 1931; 1933-1939 Concentration Camp Sachsenhausen; 1939 Belgium, France, 1941 USA; Prof. Sociology Gettysburg College; return to Germany 1957, Visiting Professor Saarbrücken, Prof. in Dacca, Bangla Desh, 1966 Prof. Political Education, Giessen.

Lazarsfeld, Paul Felix: 1901 Vienna - 1976 New York; Dr. phil. Vienna 1925; Head of Reseach Centre for Economic Psychology Vienna 1927-1933; 1933/1935 USA; Prof. Columbia U. New York.

Lederer Emil: 1882 Pilsen - 1939 New York; Habilitation Heidelberg 1912, Prof. Economics Heidelberg 1920-1931 and Berlin 1931-1933; 1933 USA; Prof. Economics New School for Social Research, New York.

Lips, Eva neé Wiegandt: 1906 Leipzig; Dr. phil. 1934 USA; return Germany 1948; Prof. Ethnology U. Leipzig.

Lips, Julius E: 1895 Saarbrücken - 1950 Leipzig; Dr. phil. Leipzig 1919; Habilitation Ethnology, Sociology 1926 Cologne, Prof. Cologne 1930-1933; 1934 USA; Prof. Ethnology New School for Social Research New York; return to Germany 1948; Prof. Ethnology U. Leipzig.

Lowe, Adolph (Löwe, Adolf): 1893 Stuttgart; Dr. jur. Tübingen 1918; Habilitation Economics Kiel 1926, Prof. Economics Frankfurt 1930-1933; 1933 Great Britain, U. Manchester, 1940 USA; Prof. Economics, New School for Social Research, New York.

Löwenstein, Julius: 1902 Karlsruhe; Dr. phil. Heidelberg 1925; Work towards Habilitation; 1933 Palestine; business activity and subsidiary academic work.

Löwenthal, Leo: 1900 Berlin; Dr. phil. Frankfurt 1923; worked at Institute for Social Research Frankfurt; 1933 Switzerland, 1934 USA; Prof. U. of California, Berkeley.

Lütkens, Charlotte neé Mendelsohn: 1896 Erfurt - 1967 Bonn; Dr. phil.;worked at Frankfurter Zeitung; 1937 Great Britain, Lecturer Sociology U. London. Return Germany 1949; worked in area of cultural policy.

Manheim, Ernst: 1900 Budapest; Dr. phil. Leipzig 1928; 1933 Great Britain, 1937 USA; Ph.D. London 1937; Prof. U. of Missouri, Kansas City.

Mann, Fritz Karl: 1883 Berlin - 1980 Washington; Dr. jur. 1906, Dr. phil. 1913; Habilitation in Economics Kiel 1914, Prof. of Economics Königsberg 1922-1926, Cologne 1926-1935; 1936 USA; Prof. Economics, Georgetown U. Washington.

Mannheim, Hermann: 1889 Libau (Liepāja); Dr. jur. Königsberg 1912, Privatdozent in Penal Law U. Berlin; Higher Regional Court President; 1935 Great Britain; Reader in Criminology London School of Economics.

Mannheim, Karl: 1893 Budapest - 1947 London; Dr. phil. Budapest 1918; Habilitation Heidelberg 1926, Prof. Sociology Frankfurt 1930-33 UK, Prof. U London.

Marcuse, Herbert: 1898 Berlin - 1979 Starnberg; Dr. phil. Freiburg 1922;worked atInstitute for Social Research Frankfurt; 1933 Switzerland; 1934 USA; Prof. Philosophy, U. of California, San Diego.

Martin, Kurt (Mandelbaum); 1904 Schweinfurt; Dr. phil. Frankfurt 1926; Assistant to Carl Grünberg, Institut for Social Research, Frankfurt; 1933 Netherlands; Institute of Social Studies, The Hague.

Massing, Paul:1902 Grumbach (Glan) - 1979 Grumbach; Dr. phil. Frankfurt 1929; 1933 Concentration Camp Orienburg; 1935 Paris, 1936 USA, 1937 Soviet Union, 1938 USA; Prof. Rutgers U. New

Brunswick.

Matthias, Leo: 1893 Berlin; Dr. jur. Greifswald 1916; 1933 Mexico, Columbia, 1939 USA, 1950 Switzerland; Prof. U. of Bogotà, Columbia and various U. in Latin America and USA.

Mauksch, Hans O. 1917 Vienna; Diploma Commercial Academy Vienna 1938; USA; Ph.D. Chicago 1960; Prof. Medical Sociology, Medical Center U. of Missouri, Columbia.

Mayer, Carl: 1902 Pforzheim - 1974 Locarno; Dr. phil. Heidelberg 1929; Assistant at Institute for Social and Political Science Heidelberg, 1934 USA; Prof. New School for Social Research, New York.

Mengelberg, Käthe (Bauer-Mengelberg): 1894 Krefeld; Dr. phil. Heidelberg 1918; Privatdozent Sociology Handelshochschule Mannheim, Prof. Institute for Vocational Education Frankfurt 1930-1933; 1933 USA; Prof. Upsala College, East Orange.

Mennicke, Carl August; 1887 Elberfeld - 1959 Frankfurt; Dr. phil. Frankfurt 1931; Lecturer University of Politics Berlin, Prof. Social Pedagogics and Social Welfare, Vocational Education Institute Frankfurt till 1933; 1934 Netherlands; Lecturer U. Amsterdam; 1941-43 Concentration Camp; return to Germany 1952, Prof. Vocational Education Institute Frankfurt.

Menzel, Herbert: 1921 Karlsbad (Katlovy Vary); USA; Ph.D. Wisconsin 1958; Prof. New York U. New York.

Meusel, Alfred: 1896 Kiel - 1960 Berlin; Dr. rer. pol. Kiel 1922; Habilitation Ethnology and Sociology TH Aachen 1923, Prof. Ethnology and Sociology TH Aachen 1925-33; 1934 Denmark; Great Britain; return to Germany 1946; Prof. Modern History Humboldt U. Berlin.

Meyer-Frank, Julie: 1897 Nürnberg - 1970 New York; Dr. phil. Erlangen 1922; Lecturer Social Welfare School Erlangen 1922-1933; 1937 USA; Prof. Social Work, New School for Social Research, New York.

Mueller, Franz: 1900 Berlin; Dr. rer. pol. Cologne 1925, Assistant Social and Political Sciences Research Institute Cologne; 1934 USA; Prof. Economics and Sociology, College of St. Thomas, St. Paul.

Nadel, Siegfried Friedrich: 1903-1956; Dr. phil.; Great Britain

Ph.D.; Lecturer Anthropology, London School of Economics, 1950 Prof. Australian National U. Canberra.

Naegele, Kaspar D.: 1923 Stuttgart - 1965 Vancouver; 1937 Great Britain, 1941 Canada; Ph.D. Harvard 1952; Prof. U. of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.

Nettl, Peter: 1926 Reichenberg (Liberei) (Sudeten) - 1968 (Air crash USA); 1936 Great Britain; Reader Political Sociology, U. of Leeds, Prof. Sociology U. Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Neurath, Otto: 1882 Vienna - 1945 Oxford; Dr. phil. Berlin 1905, Habilitation Heidelberg 1917; Director of Social and Economic Museum in Vienna 1925-1934; 1934 Netherlands, 1941 Great Britain.

Neurath, Paul: 1911 Vienna; Dr. jur. Vienna 1937; 1939 Sweden, 1940 USA; Ph.D. Columbia 1951; Prof City U. of New York, Queens College, New York, Visiting Professor U. Vienna.

Nussbaum, Arthur: 1877 Berlin - 1964 New York; Dr. jur. Berlin 1898; Habilitation 1914, Prof. Commercial Law, Berlin; 1934 USA; Prof. Public Law, Columbia U., New York.

Oppenheimer, Franz: 1864 Berlin - 1943 Los Angeles; Dr. med. Berlin 1885, Dr. phil. Kiel 1908, Habilitation Economics Berlin 1909, Prof. Economics and Sociology U. Frankfurt 1919 -1929; 1938 Japan, 1939 USA; Visiting Professor in various U. in USA.

Oppenheimer, Martin: 1930 Soest; 1937 USA; Ph.D. U of Pensylvania 1963; Prof. Rutgers U. New Brunswick.

Plessner, Helmuth: 1892 Wiesbaden; Dr. phil. 1916, Habilitation Philosophy Cologne 1920, Prof. 1926-1933; 1934 Netherlands; Prof. Sociology and Philosophy, U. Groningen 1939-50; eturn to Germany 1951, Prof. Philosophy and Sociology U. Göttingen.

Polany, Karl: 1886 Vienna - 1964 Toronto; Dr. jur. Budapest 1909, Lawyer in Budapest, sub-editor in Vienna 1919-1933; 1933 Great Britain; Prof. Economic History Columbia U New York.

Poll, Solomon: 1921 Deutschkreutz (Austria); USA; Ph.D. U. of Pennsylvania 1960, Prof. U. of New Hampshire, Durham.

Pollak, Otto: 1908 Vienna; 1938 USA; Ph. D. U. of Pennsylvania 1947; Prof. U. of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Pollock, Friedrich:1894 Freiburg - 1970 Montagnola; Dr. rer. pol. Frankfurt 1923; Habilitation Economics Frankfurt 1928; Member of Institute for Social Research Frankfurt ; 1933 Switzerland, 1934 USA; Institue for Social Research New York; return to Germany 1949; Prof. Economic Theory and Sociology, Institute for Social Research, U. Frankfurt.

Reichel-Dolmatoff, Gerardo: 1912 Salzburg; 1937 France, 1939 Columbia; Ph.D. Bogotà 1957; Prof. Sociology and Anthropology U. of the Andes, Columbia.

Reichmann, Eva, neé Jungmann: 1897 Lublinitz (Upper Silesia); Dr. phil. Heidelberg 1921; Head of Department, Central Association of German Citizens of Jewish Faith Berlin; 1939 Great Britain; Ph.D. London School of Economics 1945; Research Director, Wiener Library London.

Rheinstein, Max: 1899 Bad Kreuznach - 1977 Bad Gastein; Dr. jur. München 1924; Adviser Kaiser Wilhelm Institute of Foreign and International Private Law, Privatdozent U. Berlin 1931; 1935 USA; Prof. Legal Science U. Chicago, Chicago.

Reitzes, Dietrich C.: 1916 Berlin; USA; Ph.D. Chicago 1950, Prof. Roosevelt U. Chicago.

Reiwald, Paul: 1895 Berlin - 1951 Basel; Dr. jur. Greifswald 1919; Lawyer in Berlin; 1933 Belgium 1939 Switzerland; Lectureship in Criminology and Criminal Sociology Institut des Hautes Etudes Belgium 1934-1938, 1946 Privatdozent, U. Geneva.

Riemer, Svend: 1905 Berlin - 1977 Fullerton, Cal.; Dr. phil. Heidelberg 1930; 1933 Sweden, 1938 USA, Prof. U. of California, Los Angeles.

Rosenbaum, Eduard; 1887 Hamburg - 1979 London; Dr. phil. Kiel 1910; Syndic of Hamburg Chamber of Commerce and Director of the Commercial Library; 1934 Britain; Deputy Director of Library of London School of Economics.

Rosenstock-Heussy, Eugen: 1888 Berlin - 1973 Vermont; Dr. phil. 1906, Dr. jur. 1909, Prof.Legal Science and Sociology Breslau 1923-1933; 1933 USA; Prof. Social Philosopy Dartmouth College 1935-1957.

Rosenthal, Erich: 1912 Wetzlar; 1933 USA; Ph.D. Chicago 1948; Prof. City U New York, Queens College, New York.

Rüstow, Alexander: 1885 Wiesbaden - 1963 Heidelberg, Dr. phil. Erlangen 1908;Syndic of the Association of German Mechanical Engineering Institutions, Berlin 1924-1933; 1933 Turkey; Prof.

Economic Geography and Economic History Istanbul; return to Germany 1949, Prof. Economic and Social Sciences, U. Heildelberg.

Salomon, Albert: 1891 Berlin - 1966 New York; Dr. phil. Heidelberg 1921; Prof. Sociology Vocational Pedagogical Institute Cologne 1931-1933; 1935 USA; Prof. New School for Social Research New York.

Salomon-Delatour, Gottfried: 1896 Frankfurt - 1964 Frankfurt; Dr. phil. Strasbourg 1916; Prof. Sociology U. Frankfurt 1925-1933; 1933 France, 1941 USA; Prof. Hunter College, New York; Return to Germany 1958, Prof. U. Frankfurt.

Salz, Beate: 1913 Heidelberg; 1933 Britain 1936 USA; Ph.D. New School for Social Research 1950; Prof. Sociology and Anthropology, U. of Puerto RIco.

Schelting, Alexander von: 1894 Odessa - 1963 Lausanne; Dr. phil. Heidelberg 1922; Habilitation Heidelberg 1933; Editor at Archive for Social Science and Social Policy Heidelberg 1931-1933; 1934 USA, 1941 Switzerland; Prof. Sociology Zürich.

Schmidt-Radvanyi, Johann Lorenz (László Radvanyi): 1900 Hungary; Dr. phil.; Head of Marxist Workers' School Berlin, 1933 France, Mexico, 1947 return to Germany, Prof. for Problems of Contemporary Imperialism, Humboldt Berlin.

Schumpeter, Joseph A: 1883 Triesch (Moravia) - 1950 Taconoc, Conn; Dr. jur. Vienna 1906; Habilitation Vienna 1909, Prof. Economics Bonn 1925-1932, 1932 USA; Prof. Harvard U. Cambridge.

Schütz, Alfred: 1899 Vienna - 1959 New York; Dr. phil. Vienna 1921; Bank Director; 1938 France, 1939 USA; Prof. Sociology and Philosophy New School for Social Research, New York.

Schweitzer, Arthur: 1905 Pirmasens; 1933 Switzerland; Dr. rer. pol. Basel 1936; 1938 USA; Prof. Economic History, U. of Indiana, Bloomington.

Siegmund-Schultze, Friedrich 1885 Görlitz (now also Zgorzelx) - 1969 Soest; Lic; Founder of "Social Workers Community of East Berlin" 1911-1933, Prof. Social Pedagogics U. Berlin 1926-1933; 1933 Switzerland; return to Germany 1945, Hon. Prof. of Social Pedagogics U. Münster, Head of Department, Social Research Centre Dortmund.

Siemsen, Anna, neé Vollenweider: 1882 Mark (Westphalia) - 1951 Hamburg; Dr. phil. Bonn 1909, School Inspector, Hon. Prof. Pedagogics Jena 1923-1933, MdR; 1933 Switzerland; Return to Germany 1946; Prof. Literary History.

Sübermann, Alphons: 1909 Cologne; 1933 Dr. jur. Cologne, Public Prosecutor. 1933 Netherlands, 1935 France, 1937 Australia; Commercial activity, Lecturer State Conservatory of Music Sydney; eturn to Germany 1962, Prof. University of Cologne and U. Lausanne.

Singer, Hans W. 1910 Bonn; 1933 Turkey, Great Britain; Prof U. of Sussex.

Sinzheimer, Hugo: 1875 Worms - 1945 Overveen, Netherlands; Dr. jur., Public Prosecutor, Hon. Prof. Labour Law and Legal Sociology Frankfurt 1920-1933; Co-founder of Academy of Labour in Frankfurt; 1933 Netherlands, Prof. Amsterdam, Concentration Camp Theresienstadt.

Simmel, Arnold: 1926 Jena; 1940 USA; Ph.D. Columbia U. 1969; Prof. City of New York College, New York.

Simon, Walter B: 1918 Vienna, School Leaving Certificate Vienna 1936; 1938 Ireland, 1941 USA; Ph.D. Columbia 1957; Prof. Case Western Reserve U. Cleveland; return to Austria 1972, Prof. University of Vienna.

Sohn-Rethel, Alfred: 1899 Paris; Dr. phil. Heidelberg 1928; Academic worker on "Mitteleuropäische Wirschaftstag"; 1936 Great Britain; Lectureships and Visiting Professorships at Birmingham and Bremen.

Speier, Hans: 1905 Berlin; Dr. phil. Heidelberg 1928; Journalist in Berlin; 1933 USA; Prof. New School of Social Research, New York.

Spielman, Ralph: 1914 Leipzig; 1933 France, 1936 USA; Ph.D. Michigan 1953; Prof. Bucknell U.

Stanley, Manfred: 1932 Berlin; 1939 USA; Ph.D. New York 1965; Prof. Syracuse U., Syracuse.

Stark, Werner: 1909 Marienbad (Marránské Lázně); Dr. rer. pol. Hamburg 1934, Dr. jur. Prague 1936; 1939 Great Britain, Prof. Sociology Frodham U. New York, Visiting Professor U Salzburg.

Stavenhagen, Rudolfo: 1932 Frankfurt; Mexico; Prof., Assistant

Director UNESCO Social Science Division, Paris.

Stern, Leo: 1901 Woloka (Austria); Dr. rer. pol. Vienna 1925; Lecturer in Socialist Workers' Education System; 1934 Czechoslovakia, 1935 USSR; 1939 Habilitation U. Moscow, Lecturer at Foreign Languages Academy Moscow; return to Austria 1945, Visiting Prof. U. Vienna and Director of Institute for Science and Art Vienna 1946-1950, Prof. Modern History, U. Halle-Wittenberg 1950.

Sternberg, Fritz: 1895 Breslau - 1963 Munich; Dr. rer. pol. Breslau 1917; Assistant to Franz Oppenheimer, Frankfurt, journalist; 1933 Austria, 1936 France, 1939 USA; Prof. Economics and Social Sciences in Los Angeles and New York; return to Germany, Free-lance journalist.

Strzelewicz, Willy, 1905 Berlin; Dr. phil. Frankfurt 1931; worked Institute for Social Research Frankfurt; 1933 Czechoslovakia, 1938 Norway, 1940 Sweden, Licentiate U. Stockholm, Journalist, return to Germany 1955, Prof. PH Hannover.

Sturmthal, Adolf: 1903 Vienna; Dr. rer. pol. Vienna 1925; Journalist, 1936 Great Britain, 1938 USA; Prof. Labor and Industrial Relations, U. of Illinois, Champaign.

Sultan, Herbert: 1894 Thorn - 1954 Heidelberg; Dr. rer. pol. Freiburg 1921; Habilitation Heidelberg Economics 1931; 1939 Great Britain; return to Germany 1946, Prof. Economics Heidelberg.

Sulzbach, Walter: 1889 Frankfurt - 1969 Kilchberg near Zurich; Dr. rer. pol. Freiburg 1911, Habilitation Economics Frankfurt 1921, Prof. U. Frankfurt; 1936 USA; Prof. Social Economics Claremont College, California; return to Germany 1956, Prof. Sociology and Political Science U. Frankfurt.

Tagliocozzo, Daisy Margot neé Lilienthal: 1923 Berlin; USA; Ph.D. Chicago 1956; Prof. Massachusetts U. Boston

Thalheimer, Fred: 1929 Weinsberg; USA; Ph.D. U. of California Los Angeles 1962; Prof. San Francisco State U., San Francisco.

Tillich, Paul: 1886 Starzeddel near Guben - 1965 Chicago; Dr. phil. Breslau 1910; Privatdozent of Theology Berlin 1919, Prof. Philosophy and Sociology Frankfurt 1929-1933; 1933 USA; Prof. Religious

Philosophy, New York, Harvard, Chicago.

Wach, Joachim: 1898 Chemnitz (Karl Marx-Stadt) - 1955 Locarno; Dr. phil. Leipzig 1922, Habilitation Leipzig 1924, Prof. Religious Knowledge Leipzig 1929-1933; 1935 USA; Prof. History of Religion U. of Chicago.

Wagner, Helmut R.: 1904 Dresden; Dipl. Ing. TH Dresden; 1934 Switzerland, 1941 USA; Ph.D. New School of Social Research 1955; Prof. Hobart & Smith College, Geneva.

Weil, Felix: 1898 Argentina - 1975 Dover, USA; Dr. rer. pol. Frankfurt 1921; Founder of Malik Verlag Berlin, Chairman of Association for Social Research; 1933 France, Argentina, USA.

Weintraub, Philip: 1910 Hannover; 1933 Switzerland; Dr. jur. Basel 1935; 1937 USA; J.D. Chicago 1955, Prof. Hunter College, New York.

Wiener, Ernst Adolf: 1925 Berlin - 1967; USA; MA Columbia 1949; Prof. Brockport State College.

Willems, Emilio: 1905 Cologne; Dr. phil. Berlin 1930; 1937 Brazil, 1949 USA; Prof Anthropology and Sociology Vanderbilt U. Nashville.

Wilson, Harriet, neé Friedeberg; 1916 Berlin; 1938 Great Britain; Ph. D. U. of Wales 1959; Senior Research Associate, U. of Birmingham.

Windmuller, John P.: 1923 Dortmund, 1938 Netherlands, 1939 France, 1942 USA; Ph. D. Cornell 1951; Prof. Industrial Relations, Cornell U. Ithaca.

Winter, Ernst Karl: 1895 Vienna - 1959 Vienna; Dr. jur. Vienna 1921; Journalist, Co-founder of "Catholic Sociologists' Study Circle"; 1938 USA; Prof. Sociology and Social Philosophy New School for Social Research, New York, Writer; return to Austria 1959, Teaching work U. Vienna.

Wittfogel, Karl: 1896 Woltersdorf (Lüchow); Dr. phil. Frankfurt 1928; worked Institute of Social Research Frankfurt 1925-1933; 1933 arrested; 1934 USA; Prof. Chinese History U. Washington, Seattle.

Wolff, Kurt H: 1912 Darmstadt; 1933 Italy, 1939 USA; Dr. phil. Florence 1935; Prof. Brandeis U. Waltham.

Wolff Max: 1905 Metz - 1973 New York; Dr. jur. Cologne 1928; Trade Union Lawyer, 1933 France, 1939 USA; Prof. Long Island U.

Wunderlich, Frieda: 1884 Berlin - 1965 East Orange, N.J.; Dr. rer. pol. Freiburg 1919; Prof. Vocational Pedagogic Institute Berlin 1930-1933; 1933 USA; Prof. Sociology and Social Politics, New School for Social Research, New York.

Zeisel, Hans: 1905 Kaaden (Bohemia); Dr. jur. Vienna 1927; Lawyer, Member of Research Centre for Economic Psychology and director of it 1937/38; 1938 USA; Prof. Legal Science and Sociology U. of Chicago, Chicago.

Ziegler, Heinz Otto: 1903 Prague 1944 died in combat; Dr. phil. Heidelberg 1925; Habilitation Sociology Frankfurt 1927; 1933 Prague, Privatdozent German U. Prague 1935; 1938 Great Britain, died in combat in Royal Air FOrce.

Zloczower, Avraham: 1924 Stockerau near Vienna; 1938 USA, 1946 Palestine; Ph.D. 1968 Jerusalem; Senior Lecturer, Hebrew U. Jerusalem.

Political Science

Abraham, Henry J.: 1921 Offenbach; 1937 USA; Ph.D. U. of Pennsylvania 1952; Prof. U. of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Adler, Kenneth (Kurt): 1922 Karlsruhe; 1937 Great Britain, 1939 USA; Ph.D. Chicago 1956; U.S. Information Agency, Lecturer at various American Universities.

Arendt, Hannah: 1906 Hannover - 1975 New York, Dr. phil. Heidelberg 1928; 1934 France, 1941 USA; Prof. Political Theory; New School for Social Research, New York.

Beck, Curt F.: 1924 Berlin; 1933 Czechoslovakia, 1938 USA; Ph.D. Harvard 1950; Prof. U. of Connecticut, Storrs.

Bergstraesser, Arnold: 1896 Darmstadt - 1964 Freiburg; Dr. rer. pol. Heidelberg 1923; Habilitation Heidelberg 1928, Prof. of Political Science Heidelberg; 1935 USA; Prof. of German Cultural History U. of Chicago; return to Germany 1952, 1954 Prof. Political Science and Sociology U. Freiburg.

Borkenau, Franz: 1900 Vienna - 1957 Zurich; Dr. phil. Leipzig 1924; worked Institute for Social Research Frankfurt; 1934 Great Britain, 1935 Panama, 1936 Great Britain; Lecturer and Journalist;

Return to Germany 1946; Prof. Modern History U. Marburg, Chief Editor of "Ostprobleme"; Free-lance Writer in Zurich.

Braunthal, Gerald (Gerhard): 1923 Gera; 1933 Belgium, Great Britain, 1936 USA; Ph.D. Columbia 1953; Prof. U. of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Brecht, Arnold: 1884 Lübeck - 1977 Eutin; Dr. jur. Leipzig 1906; Director in Prussian Ministry of State 1928-1933. Lecturer University of Political Science Berlin; 1933 USA; Prof. New School for Social Research, New York.

Breit, Peter K.: 1934 Dresden; 1939 USA; Ph. D. U. of Massachusetts 1967; Prof. U. of Hartford, Hartford.

Bretton, Henry L. 1916 Berlin; USA; Ph.D. Yale 1951; Prof. State U. of New York, Brockport.

Bruning, Heinrich: 1885 Münster - 1970 Norwich, Vt.; Dr. phil. Bonn 1915, Chancellor 1930-1932; 1934 Netherlands, 1935 USA; Prof. Political Science Harvard 1939-1950; return to Germany 1951, Prof U. Cologne till 1955, then again in USA.

Dallin, Alexander; 1924 Berlin; 1935 Poland, 1939 France, 1940 USA; Ph.D. Columbia 1953; Prof. Stanford U. Stanford.

Deutsch, Karl W. 1912 Prague; Dr. jur. German U. Prague 1938; 1938 USA; Ph.D. Harvard 1951; Prof. Harvard U. Cambridge and Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin.

Diamant, Alfred: 1917 Vienna; School Leaving Certificat and Textile College Vienna; 1939 Great Britain: 1940 USA; Ph.D. Yale 1957; Prof. Indiana U. Bloomington.

Dror, Yehezkel: 1928 Vienna; 1938 Palestine; S.J.D. Harvard 1957; Prof. Hebrew University, Jerusalem.

Dunner, Joseph (Dünner): 1908 Fürth - 1978 New York; Dipl.econ. Frankfurt 1932; 1933 Switzerland, 1935 USA; Dr. phil. Basel 1934; Prof. Yeshiva U. New York.

Ebenstein, William; 1910 Austria - 1976 Santa Barbara, California; Dr. jur. Vienna 1934; 1934 Great Britain, 1936 USA, Ph. D. Wisconsin 1938; Prof. U. of California, Santa Barbara.

Eckstein, Harry: 1924 Schotten; USA; Ph.D. Harvard 1954;

Prof. Princeton U. Princeton.

Edinger, Lewis Joachim: 1922 Frankfurt; 1936 USA; Ph.D. Columbia 1951; Prof. Columbia U. New York.

Ehrlich, Gerd W.: 1922 Berlin, School Certificate Berlin 1940; 1943 Switzerland, 1946 USA; Ph.D. Johns Hopkins 1972; Prof. Towson State College.

Ehrmann, Henry Walter: 1908 Berlin; Dr. jur. Freiburg 1932; Journalist, 1934 Czechoslovakia, 1935 France, 1940 USA; Prof. Dartmouth College, Hannover.

Engel, Salo: 1908 Austria - 1972; 1st State Exam in Law Frankfurt 1931; 1933 Switzerland; 1937 Netherlands; 1941 USA; Dr. sc. pol. Geneva 1936; Prof. U. of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Engelmann, Frederic C.: 1921 Vienna; 1938 USA; Ph.D. Yale 1954; Prof. U. of Alberta, Edmonton Alberta, Canada.

Eulau, Heinz: 1915 Offenbach; 1939 Philipines, USA; Ph.D. Berkeley 1941; Prof. Stanford U. Stanford.

Feinstein, Otto: 1930 Vienna; USA; Ph.D. Chicago 1965; Prof. Wayne State U. Detroit.

Feit, Edward:1924 Vienna; South Africa; Ph.D. U. of Michigan 1965; Profl. U. of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Feld, Werner: 1910 Dusseldorf; Dr. jur. Berlin 1932; 1938 USA; Ph.D. Tulane 1962; Prof. Louisiana State U. New Orleans.

Flechtheim, Ossip: 1909 Nikolaev (Russia); Dr.jur. Cologne 1934; 1935 Switzerland, 1939 USA; Return to Germany 1946; Dr. phil. Heidelberg 1947; Prof. FU Berlin.

Fliess, Perer: 1915 Stuttgart; School Leaving Certificate 1933; 1938 USA; Ph. D. Harvard 1951; Prof. U. of Massachusetts, Amerherst.

Frankel, Joseph: 1913 Lviv; 1935 Australia; 1939 Great Britain; Ph.D. Yale 1960; Prof. U. Southampton.

Fraenkel, Ernst: 1898 Cologne - 1975 Berlin; Dr. jur. Frankfurt 1923; Syndic of German Metal Workers Association until 1933; 1938 USA; J.D. Chicago 1942; Return to Germany 1951, Prof. FU Berlin.

Freund, Gerald: 1930 Berlin; 1939 Netherlands; 1940 USA; Ph.D. Oxford 1955; Prof. Hunter College, New York.

Freund, Ludwig: 1898 Mühlheim, Ruhr - 1970 Hannover; Dr. phil. Leipzig 1922; Syndic of Central Union of German Citizens of the Jewish Faith 1924-1933; 1934 USA; Prof. Roosevelt U. Chicago; return to Germany 1959, Visiting Prof. at various Universities.

Friters, Gerard Martin: 1911 Berlin; 1935 Switzerland, 1937 Great Britain; Dr. rer. pol. Geneva 1939; Prof. U. of Laval, Quebec, Canada.

(Breslau)

Goodmann, Ernest: 1925 Wroclaw; USA; Ph.D. Nebraska 1965; Prof. State U. of New York, Onconta.

Grabowsky, Adolf: 1880 Berlin - 1969 Arlesheim (Basel); Dr. jur. Würzburg 1903; Founder and Publisher " Zeitschrift für Politik" 1907-1933; Lecturer University Political Science Berlin; 1934 Switzerland; Founder of journal "Weltpolitisches Archiv"; return to Germany, Prof. U. Marburg 1950-1965.

Gross, Franz Bruno: 1919 Vienna; USA; Ph.D. Harvard 1952; Prof. Duquesne U. Pittsburgh.

Grosser, Alfred; 1925 Frankfurt; 1934 France; Doctorate Paris 1960; Prof. U. Paris.

Grunbaum, Werner F.: 1930 Giessen, 1937 USA; Ph.D. Chicago 1955; Prof. U. of Missouri, St. Louis.

Gurian, Waldemar: 1902 St. Petersburg (Russia) - 1954 South Haven, Mich,; Dr. phil. Cologne 1923; Editorial writer and free-lance journalist; 1934 Switzerland; 1937 USA; Prof. U. of Notre Dame, South Bend.

Gurland, Arcadius: 1904 Moscow - 1979 Darmstadt; Dr. phil. Leipzig 1929; Editorial writer; 1933 Belgium, France, 1940 USA; Worked at Institute for Social Research New York; return to Germany 1950, Prof. Darmstadt.

Gutmann, Immanuel Edwin: 1924 Munich; 1936 Palestine; Ph.D. Columbia 1952; Prof. Hebrew University Jerusalem.

Haas, Ernst B.: 1924 Frankfurt; 1938 USA; Ph.D. Columbia 1952; Prof U. of California, Berkeley.

Haas, William (Wilhelm): 1883 Nürnberg - 1956 New York; Dr. phil.; Privatdozent Cologne 1920. Lecturer University of Political Science, Berlin inter alia Prof. TH Berlin, Psychology of Peoples, Politics 1927-1933; 1933 USA; Prof. Asia Institute, Columbia U. New York.

Hamburger, Ernst: 1890 Berlin - 1980 New York; Dr. phil. Berlin 1913, Senior Official; Member of Prussian Parliament; 1933 France, 1940 USA; Prof. New School for Social Research 1946-1956, Journalist, New York.

Halpern, Manfred: 1924 Mittweida; USA; Ph.D. Johns Hopkins 1960; Prof. Pinceton U. Princeton.

Heidenheimer Arnold J.: 1929 Würzburg; 1939 Great Britain; 1940 USA; Ph.D. London School of Economics 1957; Prof. Washington U. St. Louis.

Heller, Francis H.: 1917 Vienna; 1938 USA; Ph.D. Virginia 1948; Prof. U. of Kansas, Lawrence.

Heller, Hermann: 1891 Teschen - 1933 Madrid; Dr. jur. Graz 1915; Habilitation Kiel 1920, Prof. Public Law Frankfurt; 1933 Spain.

Hermens, Ferdinand A.: 1906 Neiheim Kr. Höxter; Dr. rer. pol. Bonn 1931, worked towards Habilitation; 1934 Great Britain, 1935 USA; Prof. U. of Notre Dame, South Bend; return to Germany 1959, Prof. Cologne.

Herrmann, Klaus J. 1929 Cammin (Pomerania); 1940 China; 1947 USA; Ph.D. Minnesota 1960; Prof. Sir George Williams College, Montreal, Canada.

Herz, John (Hans): 1908 Düsseldorf; Dr. jur. Cologne 1931; 1935 Switzerland, 1938 USA; Prof. City U. of New York, New York.

Hilberg, Raul: 1926 Vienna; USA; Ph.D. Columbia 1955; Prof. U. of Vermont, Burlington.

Hirsch-Weber, Wolfgang: 1920 Mannheim; 1938 Bolivia, return to Germany 1949, Dr. phil. Heildelberg 1954, Prof. U. Mannheim.

Holborn, Louise; 1898 Berlin; 1934 USA; Ph.D. Havard 1938; Prof. Radcliffe College, Cambridge.

Hula, Erich: 1900 Vienna; Studied Law and Political Science in Vienna; Chamber of Labour Vienna; 1938 USA; Prof. New School for Social Research, New York.

Jäckh, Ernst: 1875 Urach - 1959 New York; Dr. phil. 1899; Founder (1920) and President of German High School for Politics, Berlin till 1933, Journalist; 1933 Great Britain, 1940 USA; Prof. Coumbia U. New York.

Jacob, Herbert: 1933 Augsburg; 1938 Great Britain, 1940 USA; Ph.D. Yale 1960; Prof. North western U.

Kautsky, John H.: 1922 Vienna; 1938 Great Britain; Ph.D. Harvard 1951; Prof. Washington U. St. Louis.

Kettler, David (Ketzlach): 1930 Leipzig; 1940 USA; Ph.D. Columbia 1960; Prof. Trent U. Peterborough, Ontario.

Kirchheimer, Otto: 1905 Heilbronn - 1965 New York; Dr. jur. Bonn 1928; Lawyer, Teacher of Political Science at Trade Union Schools, worked at Institute of Social Research; 1934 France, 1937 USA; Prof. Columbia U. New York.

Kissinger, Henry: 1923 Fürth; 1938 USA; Ph.D. Harward 1954; Prof. Harvard U. Cambridge; US Secretary of State.

Kohn, Walter: 1923 Lichtenfels; 1939 Great Britain; Ph.D. New School of Social Research, New York, 1954; Prof. Illinois State U , Normal.

Kitzinger, Uwe: 1928 Nürnberg: 1939 UK; B. Litt. Oxford 1956, Fellow Nuffield College, Oxford.

Korsch, Karl: 1886 Tostedt (Luneburg Heath) - 1961 Belmont, Mass.; Dr. jur. Jena 1910, Habilitation in Law Jena 1919; Prof. Civil Procedure and Labour Law 1923-1933. MdR; 1933 Denmark, Great Britain, 1936 USA, Prof. Sociology, New Orleans.

Kort, Fred: 1919 Vienna; Stud. jur. Vienna 1937/38; 1939 USA; Ph.D. Northwestern U. 1950; Prof. U. of Connecticut, Storrs.

Lande, Carl Hermann: 1924 Tübingen; USA; Ph.D. Harvard 1958; Prof. U. Kansas, Lawrence.

Landshut, Siegfried: 1897 Strasbourg - 1968 Hamburg; Dr. rer.

pol. Freiburg 1921; Habilitation Hamburg 1932; 1936 Palestine; Research Member of Hebrew University Jerusalem; return to Germany 1951, Prof. of Sociology, then Political Science U. Hamburg.

Leihholz, Gerhard: 1901 Berlin; Dr. phil. 1921, Dr. jur. 1925; Habilitation Berlin 1928, Prof. Public Law Greifswald, 1929-1935; 1935 Great Britain, World Council of Churches, Oxford; return to Germany 1947, Prof. Public Law and Political Science, U. Göttingen, Federal Constitutional Judge 1951-1971.

Levi, Werner: 1912 Halberstadt, Dr. jur. Freiburg 1934; 1940 USA; Ph.D. U. of Minnesota 1944; Prof. U. of Hawaii, Honolulu.

Levine, Victor, T.: 1928 Berlin; 1935 France, 1939 USA; Ph.D. Los Angeles 1961; Prof. Washington U, St. Louis.

Lewy, Günther: 1923 Wroclaw; USA; Ph.D. Columbia 1957; Prof. Political Science and History, U. of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Lichtheim, Georg: 1912 Berlin - 1973 London; Studied in Berlin and Heidelberg; 1934 Palestine, 1945 Great Britain; Journalist and Visiting Lecturer.

Löwenberg, Gerhard: 1928 Berlin; USA; Ph.D. Cornell 1954; Prof. U. of Iowa, Iowa City.

Lowenstein Karl: 1891 Munich - 1973 Heidelberg; Dr. jur. Munich 1913; Habilitation in Public Law Munich 1929, 1933 USA; Prof. Political Science, Amherst College, Amherst, em. Prof. Public Law U. Munich.

Löwenthal Richard: 1908 Berlin; Dr. phil. Heidelberg 1931; journalistic and political activity; 1935 Czechoslovakia, 1936 Great Britain, 1937 Czechoslovakia, 1938 France, 1939 Great Britain; journalistic activity; return to Germany 1961, Prof. FU Berlin.

Mark, Max: 1910 Vienna; Dr. jur. Vienna 1933; 1941 China, 1947 USA; Prof. Wayne State U. Detroit.

Marquis, Lucian C. (Markiewicz): 1921 Stuttgart; 1933 France, 1934 Italy, 1937 USA; Ph.D. Berkeley 1959; Prof. Pitzer College, Claremont.

Mason, Henry L.: 1921 Berlin; USA; Ph.D. Columbia 1951; Prof. Tulane U. New Orleans.

Matthias, Herbert L.C. 1912 Darmstadt, Dr. jur. 1937; USA; Prof U. of Texas, Arlington.

Mayer, Henry: 1919 Mannheim; Switzerland, Italy, Britain, Australia; Prof. Political Theory, U. of Sydney, Australia.

Mehnert, Klaus: 1906 Moscow; Dr. phil. Berlin 1931, Sub-editor "Osteuropa" 1931-1934; 1936 USA, 1941 China; Prof. Political Science U. of Hawaii, German Medical Academy Shanghai 1941 -1945; return to Germany 1951, Cheif editor "Osteuropa", 1961 Prof. TH Aachen.

Meisel, James Hans: 1900 Berlin; Dr. phil. Heidelberg 1922; 1934 Italy, 1938 USA; Prof. U. of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Meisel, John: 1923 Vienna; Great Britain; Ph.D. London 1958; Prof. Queens U, Kingston, Ontario.

Mayer, Alfred G. 1920 Bielefeld; School Leaving Certificate Bielefeld 1938; 1939 USA; Ph.D. Harvard 1950; Prof. U. of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Michael, Franz: 1907 Freiburg, Dr. jur. Freiburg 1933; Attaché in Foreign Office; 1934 China, Prof. Chekiang U., 1939 USA; Prof. Sinology and Political Science, George Washington U. Washington.

Mitau, Gunter Theodore: 1920 Berlin; USA; Ph.D. Minnesota 1948; Prof. Macalaster College, St. Paul.

Morgenthau, Hans Joachim: 1904 Coburg - 1980 New York; Dr. jur. Frankfurt 1929; Lawyer, Chairman of Frankfurt Labour Court; 1933 Switzerland, 1937 USA; Prof. U. of Chicago, City U. of New York.

Morstein Marx, Fritz: 1900 Hamburg - 1969 Baden-Baden; Dr. jur. Hamburg, Assistant U. Hamburg; 1933 USA; Prof. Political Science, City U. of New York, Hunter College, US-Office of the Budget; return to Germany 1963, Prof. Administrative Science, College of Administrative Sciences, Speyer.

Morton, Henry: 1929 Vienna; USA; Ph.D. Columbia 1959; Prof. City U. of New York, Queens College, New York.

Muller, Steven: 1927 Hamburg; USA; Ph.D. Cornell 1958; Prof. John Hopkins U. Baltimore.

Munk, Frank: 1901 Kuttenberg (Bohemia); Dr. rer. pol. Prague 1936; 1938 USA; Prof. Portland State U. Oregon.

Neumann, Franz L.: 1900 Kattowitz - 1954 Car accident in Switzerland; Dr. jur. Frankfurt 1923, Assistant to Hugo Sinzheimer, Syndic of Building Trade Union and Lecturer in Labour Law University of Politics Berlin; 1933 Great Britain, Ph.D. London School of Economics 1936; 1936 USA; Prof. of Government and Public Law, Columbia U., New York.

Neumann, Robert: 1916 Vienna; Civil Service exam Vienna, 1938 Concentration Camp Dachau; 1939 USA; Ph.D. Minnesota 1946; Prof. U. of California, Los Angeles, US Ambassador to Afghanistan, Morocco; Institute for Study of Diplomacy, Georgetown U. Washington.

Neumann, Sigmund: 1904 Leipzig - 1962 Frankfurt; Dr. phil. Leipzig 1927, Lecturer Dt. University of Politics Berlin 1928-1933; 1933 Great Britain, 1934 USA; Prof. Wes eyan U. Middletown.

Newmann, Karl (Neumann): 1913 Hohenelbe, Bohemia; Dr. jur. Prague 1938; 1939 Great Britain; Prof. U. Dacca, Bangla Desh 1958-1961; return to Germany 1961, Prof. U Cologne.

Niemeyer, Gerhard: 1907 Essen; Dt. jur. Kiel 1932, Assistant to Hermann Heller Frankfurt; 1933 Spain, 1937 USA; Prof. U. of Notre Dame, South Bend.

Nova, Fritz: 1915 Berlin, School Leaving Certificate Berlin 1934; 1936 Italy, 1939 USA; Ph.D. U. of Pennsylvania 1943; Prof. Villa Nova U.

Oppenheim, Felix E.: 1913 Frankfurt; School Leaving Certificate Frankfurt 1932; 1933 Belgium, 1941 USA; Ph.D. Princeton 1942; Prof. U. of Massachusetts.

Pächter, Heinz: 1907 Berlin - 1980 New York; Dr. phil. Berlin 1930; 1933 France; 1941 USA; Journalist and Lecturer New School for Social Research, New York.

Pinner, Frank: 1914 Königsberg; France, USA; Ph.D. 1954; Prof. Michigan State U.

Possony, Stefan: 1913 Vienna; Dr. phil. Vienna 1935; Journalist; 1940 USA;

Member of Hoover Institution, Stanford.

Roetter, Friedrich (Roedelheimer): 1888 Berlin - 1953 East Orange; Dr. jur. Jena 1912, Lawyer; 1935 France, 1939 USA; Ph.D. Wisconsin 1947; Prof. Upsala College, East Orange.

Rommen, Heinrich A.: 1897 Cologne - 1967 Arlington; Dr. rer. pol. Münster 1924, Dr. jur. Bonn 1930; Worked in People Association for Catholic Germany; 1938 USA; Prof. Georgetown U. Washington.

Rothschild, Josef: 1931 Fulda; 1939 Netherlands, 1940 USA; Ph.D. Oxford 1955; Prof. Columbia U. New York.

Rovan, Joseph (Rosenthal): 1918 Munich; 1936 France, Journalist, Prof. German Civili ation, U. of Paris-Vincennnes.

Rudolph, Suzanne neé Hoeber: 1930 Mannheim; USA; Ph.D. Radcliffe College 1955; Prof. U. of Chicago.

Rustow, Dankwart A.: 1924 Berlin; 1933 Turkey; Ph.D. Yale 1951; Prof. New York City U, New York.

Schick, Franz: 1901 Vienna; Dr. jur. Vienna 1931; 1938 USA; Ph.D. U. of California, 1944; Prof. U. of Utah.

Secher, Herbert: 1924 Vienna; 1939 USA; Ph.D. Wisconsin 1954; Prof. Kansas State U.

Seliger, Martin: 1916 Halle; Palestine; Prof. Hebrew U. Jerusalem.

Shell, Kurt Leo (Schell): 1920 Vienna; School Leaving Certificate Vienna; 1938 Great Britain, 1940 USA; Ph.D. Columbia 1956, Return to Germany 1961, Prof. Political Education, U. Frankfurt.

Sigel, Roberta neé Schönland: 1918 Berlin; 1938 USA; Ph.D. Clark U. 1950; Prof. Rutgers U. New Brunswick.

Simons, Hans: 1893 Velbert - 1972 New York; Dr. jur. Königsberg 1921; Prime Minister Upper Silesia 1930-1932; 1933 USA; Prof. International Relations, New School for Social Research, New York.

Sondermann, Fred: 1923 Horn; 1939 USA; Ph.D. Yale 1953; Prof. Colorado College.

Spiro, Herbert: 1924 Hamburg; 1938 USA, Ph.D. Harvard 1953; Prof. U. of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, US Diplomat; Prof. of American Politics, FU Berlin.

Staudinger, Hans: 1889 Worms - 1980 New York; Dr. phil. Heidelberg 1913; Secretary of State in Prussian Ministry of Trade 1929- 1932, Lecturer Germany University of Politics Berlin; 1933 USA; Prof. Economics, New SChool of Social Research, New York.

Steiner, Kurt: 1912 Vienna; Dr. jur. Vienna 1935; 1938 USA; Ph.D. Stanford 1945; Prof. Stanford U.

Sterling, Eleonore, neé Oppenheimer: 1925 Heidelberg - 1968 Ebersteinburg; 1938 USA; M.A. Columbia 1948; Return to Germany 1953; Dr. phil. Frankfurt 1955; Prof. PH Osnabrück.

Strauss, Leo: 1899 Kirchhain (Hessen) - 1973 Annapolis; Dr. phil. Hamburg 1921; Academy of Jewish Studies Berlin 1925-1932; 1932 France, 1934 Great Britain, 1938 USA; Prof. U. Chicago.

Tachau, Frank: 1929 Braunschweig; 1936 USA; Ph.D. Chicago 1958; Prof. U. of Illinois, Chicago.

Tauber, Kurt: 1922 Vienna; 1938 USA; Ph.D. Harvard 1951; Prof. Williams College.

Vernon, Manfred C (Vohl): 1907 Düsseldorf; Dr. jur. Berlin 1933; 1939 USA; Ph.D. Stanford 1948; Western Washington State College.

Voegelin, Eric: 1901 Cologne; Dr. rer. pol. Vienna 1922, Habilitation Vienna 1929, Associate Prof Vienna 1936-38; 1939 USA; Prof. U. of Louisiana, Baton Rouge; return to Germany 1958, Prof. U. Munich; 1969 Member Hoover Institution Stanford.

Waldmann, Eric: 1914 Vienna; Dr. phil. Vienna 1938; 1938 USA; Ph.D. George Washington U. 1955; Prof. U. of Calgary, Canada.

Weiker, Walter (Weikersheim) 1931 Berlin; 1938 USA; Ph.D. Princeton 1962; Prof. Rutgers U. New Brunswick.

Weiss, Herbert Felix: 1930 Vienna; 1938 Egypt, 1947 USA; Ph.D. Columbia 1965; Prof. Brooklin College.

Weimer, Kurt: 1915 Tetlingen; USA; Ph.D. New York 1957; Prof. Stroudsburg State College.

Wolfe, George: 1904 Vienna; Dr. phil. Vienna 1928, Dr. jur. Vienna 1930; Lawyer; 1939 USA; Prof. College of Idaho, Cladwell.

Zinner, Paul: 1922 Košice (Czecholslovakia) USA; Ph.D. Harvard 1953; Prof. U. of California, Davis.

The Development of Sociology in Germany after the Second World War

1945 - 1967

by

M. Rainer Lepsius

Preliminary

The development of sociology in the Federal Republic after the Second World War can be looked at from various angles. From the point of view of the history of science the rapid institutionalization of sociology in tertiary education is easily observed. As regards theory, however, developments were far more complicated. Selective transfers of positions from the twenties were mixed with the selective absorption of international developments, without any specifically German profile taking shape. The "German sociology", internationally perceived, with distinct characteristics, had become a sociology in Germany, following essentially the international development. From the viewpoint of intellectual history, sociology remained stuck in the ambivalence between interpreting the meaning of human existence and making empirical partial analyses of social structures. Taking the approach of contemporary history, sociologized cultural criticism met with far greater response than did empirical analytical research. Within sociology, the contrast between the representatives of an empirically based "sociological theory" and a hermeneutically exploratory "theory of society" was significant for self-perception, it was

to have a polarizing effect in the late sixties. From the viewpoint of relevance, sociology had no influence on the formation of society in the Federal Republic during the late forties and early fifties, and even in the reform period of the late sixties, sociologized cultural criticism was far more important than sociological analysis or even forecasting. Sociology was primarily oriented towards phenomena of German society; approaches were accordingly provincial German, with little regard for possibilities of inter-cultural comparison. Nevertheless, it followed largely American sociological trends, from the end of ideology thesis to the problems of "marginal groups" and participation. Perhaps Marxist and neo-Marxist approaches did play a larger role in the Federal Republic, but on the whole even the critical consciousness of German sociology was more highly internationalized than might be suspected.

This article neither develops these questions systematically, nor attempts a sociology of sociology in the Federal Republic, but is instead confined to presenting the history of the development of sociology as an academic discipline in the years of reconstruction and consolidation, up to the end of the sixties. The development of sociology from around 1968 onwards falls outside the selected period; its inclusion would call for a broader approach, going beyond the purely academic framework.

I. The Starting Point : 1933 to 1945

The de facto dissolution of sociology as an academic discipline

in the National Socialist period determined the starting point for the refoundation of sociology after the war. By contrast with other sciences, sociology did not exist as an institutionalized discipline in 1945. It had instead to be reconstructed personally, institutionally and as an academic programme. The historically important German tradition of sociology had been broken off by the National Socialist seizure of power. The majority of sociologists from the Weimar period had emigrated; it was scarcely possible to recruit academic successors and sociological approaches in a theoretical conception had not been pursued even by those who remained in Germany.

Looking through the calenders of the universities from the late twenties and early thirties for professional staff members who offered sociological courses for a number of semesters, one finds some 55 full- or part-time sociologists at German universities in 1932/33 (see Table 1). Of these, only 16 were still working in universities by the end of the "purge", in around 1938. Of the eight senior professors of retirement age, two were still giving lectures. Of the 27 professors below retirement age, 12 emigrated, a further six were dismissed but stayed in Germany, and nine continued in their posts, though only few of them taught sociological courses regularly. Of the 20 senior lecturers and associate professors, 17 emigrated. Leaving those of retirement age out of consideration - they would in any case have disappeared in time even under different political circumstances - we may state that two-thirds of the full- and part-time sociology teachers were driven out of the universities as a result of political events[1].

Additionally, in the National Socialist period scarcely any

young sociologists could be trained. After 1933 about eight people who could be counted as sociologists took a Habilitation at German universities (see Table 2). It is hard to estimate the number forced by political circumstances to abandon a Habilitation. The figure is likely to be at least 20. Most were only able to continue their academic career abroad, following emigration (e.g. T. Adorno, R. Behrendt, N. Elias, H. Gerth, R. König, L. Löwenthal, F. Manheim, C. Mayer, P. Reiwald, S. Riemer, A. Silbermann, H. Speier, W. Stark, K. Wittfogel). Others only began an academic career after the war (e.g. O.H. von der Gablentz, O. Stammer). Those named were already part of the potential academic successor generation around 1933, and there must certainly have been others overlooked here.

Prior to 1933, there were five centres where sociology was concentrated: Berlin, Frankfurt, Heidelberg, Cologne and Leipzig. All were dissolved. In Berlin, older members of faculty were retired, and younger ones eliminated through the "purge" of the Deutsche Hochschule für Politik and the dissolution of the sociological staffs of the trade unions and the adult education system. The strong representation of sociology in Frankfurt, through Karl Mannheim and the Institut für Sozialforschung, was immediately destroyed in 1933. Karl Mannheim and Max Horkheimer, the two full professors, were dismissed, and the seminar for sociology was formally dissolved in 1941. The Institut für Sozialforschung had to move, first to Paris and then to New York. In Heidelberg, Alfred Weber was compulsorily retired, and the younger lecturers dismissed. In Cologne, the Forschungsinstitut für Soziologie was closed. Only

in Leipzig, under the influence of Hans Freyer was an adapted sociology able to survive until the war; but even Freyer practically abandoned his sociology lectures after 1938. By 1934, all professional journals in Germany had ceased to appear. The Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung had emigrated to Paris along with the Institut für Sozialforschung, while the Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Soziologie, edited by Richard Thurnwald, had to cease publication in 1933, as did the Kölner Vierteljahrshefte für Soziologie in 1934, edited by Leopold von Wiese.

What remained was the chair and seminar in sociology in Hamburg, with Andreas Walther, who did no further major work; the continuing, though marginal, teaching in Giessen and Marburg, and a few sociologists in Jena, Leipzig and Nuremberg, and for limited periods also in Königsberg and Prague who sought to practice an "folk" and "German" sociology (for details see Table 1)[2].

These latter also changed the intellectual character os sociology, and effectively brought it to an end. The object of "Germany" sociology was, they insisted, to be the folk (Volk), which as the "subject of history" was also humanity's most important social form, and, in its "intrinsic essence" transcended empirical sociology (e.g. Max Rumpf). Although this "folk sociology" had developed independently of National Socialism, after the seizure of power it adopted National Socialist terminology and concepts, partly for opportunist reasons and partly from conviction. An intellectual tradition that had constantly opposed the programme of an empirical structural and functional analysis of the social conditions of human existence, strived to gain influence with the help of National Socialism. This tradition

is based on the conviction of the special historical character of the Germans, on the idea of the essential unity of the social, cultural and political life of "natural" communities and on political resentment against the Western model of a democratic industrial society based on individual legal rights and the institutionalization of conflicts.

Taking up both the ideas of Herder, Fichte and Hegel and the ideals of the social order of the romantics, from Justus Möser to W.H. Riehl, these sociologists developed a concept which rejected sociology as a science of the structural conditions of human existence; and instead advocated a philosophy of history in

allegedly anthropologically definable structures. If the Volk is taken as the highest reality, then the restoration of the community of the Volk becomes the central meaning for all social action. The Volk, as a conceptual order with normative validity, could then be understood,
both as a historical product of common cultural ideas and as a biological unit. The idea of the wholeness of a way of life led to a one-sided stress on pre-industrial and rural social structures and hence to an openness towards "corporate" forms of social integration. The stress on a voluntarist social order led to an indifference to institutions, and to an affinity for institutionally uncontrolled, personally legitimized political leadership[3]. From here it was relatively simple to build a bridge to the political system of National Socialism, even if this ideological move was not made by all who shared these ideas.

However, no National Socialist sociology appeared, nor could it,

if for no other reason than that the racist determinism of the National Socialist Weltanschauung constituted a counter programme to sociological analysis. The myth of the Volk replaced the analytical concept of society, social mobility was replaced by social-genetic "filtration"; the idea of the community of the Volk did not allow any study of differentiation of interests; social conflicts were condemned as showing a lack of loyalty to the leadership; social stratification became status gradation; political order was reduced to consciousness of elites. No new sociology chairs were set up, if one disregards the professorships in ethnic theory and ethnographical sociology in Jena (M.H. Boehm), for the ethnography and geography of Great Britain and the Commonwealth in Berlin (K.H. Pfeffer) and for social anthropology and ethnobiology in Prague (K.V. Müller). Even Hans Freyer, whose writings of the thrities laid the foundations for the new "German" sociology, was unable, despite several National Socialist publications, to gain any influence. Neither his efforts to praise "German" sociology as the "structural theory of the community" (1935), nor his proposal for university reform (1933) on the educational goal of the "political man routed in his ethnicity", to give "study as a whole a political meaning" and at the same time to spread a "political ethic" (1933) of the "sacrifice of the natural man and readiness for secular goals", were able to provide this "new German sociology" with any noteworthy academic space[4]. The new sociology was restricted to area studies and ethnography, and on the whole also remained intellectually insignificant[5].

The Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie had also ceased to function. With the ultimatum of setting up a counter-foundation, the "völkisch" forces had in 1933 called for the political Gleichschaltung of the

Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie to the "New Order", and at a hastily convoked general assembly on 29 December 1933 elected Hans Freyer "Führer of the German sociologists", with seven votes to six and one abstention. But Freyer, however, did not cooperate with these interests, and in 1934 practically closed down the association. No events were held under its name; it did not formally exclude politically persecuted members, nor accept any new, and possibly National Socialist ones, nor collect membership fees. The Führerprinzip worked well in this case: it allowed Freyer to close the association without any formality, and avoid compromising it through National Socialist, race hygiene and ethnopedagogical activities.[6]

II. The Revival: 1945 to 1949

After the end of the war, while there was no longer any sociology, there were still a number of sociologists who now set about reconstructing the discipline. Leopold von Wiese soon took the initiative in refounding the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie. The inaugural meeting was held on 5 and 6 April 1946, in Bad Godesberg. Of the old membership, some 10 people turned up; Wiese had invited some 20 others. A constitution was adopted and and an executive elected. Wiese became President, a post which he held until 1955. The executive also included representatives of the four occupation zones: Christian Eckert (then Mayor of Worms, French zone), Georg Jahn (Halle, Russian zone), Graf Solms (Marburg) and Stoltenberg (Giessen) - both American zone, while Wiese lived in the British zone. A sociological congress was planned for September of the same year in Frankfurt: the 8th Sociological Congress, originally scheduled for 1932, then postponed until 1933 and subsequently not held at all.

This rapid reactivaion of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie was the work of bourgeois-liberal academics brought together by Leopold von Wiese. Of the first 50 or so members in 1946, 20 were old members. Among the new ones were a number of political economists, of which only a few, such as Heinz Sauermann and Alfred Müller-Armack, had closer relationships to sociology. The revival was greatly aided by the advice and help of the then American University officer, Edward Y. Hartshorne, who was himself a sociologist and professor at Yale university[7].

Leopold von Wiese's activity in the first post-war years was very impressive. Under his chairmanship, the 8th Sociological Congress in Frankfurt in 1946 was followed by practically annual academic congresses: the 9th Sociological Congress in Worms in 1948, the first Anthropological Social Conference in Mainz 1949, the 10th Sociological Congress in Detmold in 1950, the 2nd Anthropological-Social Conference in Mainz in 1951, the 11th Sociological Congress in 1952 in Weinheim and the 12th Social-logical Congress in 1954, linked with the 3rd Anthropological-Social Conference, in Heidelberg (see Table 6). The Cologne Forschungsinstitut für Sozial- und Verwaltungswissenschaften and, linked with it, the Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie, were re-established in 1948, the latter being edited by Leopold von Wiese until 1954. Wiese reached the age of 70 in 1946, but even after his retirement he continued to teach in Cologne, and as visiting professor in Bonn, and, from time to time also in Mainz and Frankfurt. This activity of von Wiese did not make much impression on the content of post-war sociology. The formal classifications of social relationships and

formations that he had sketched out in the early twenties met with little response, and the same applied to efforts by Johann Plenge[8].

Immediately after the war, other sociologists from the twenties reappeared in the faculties and in public. Particular mention here should be made of Alfred Weber, compulsorily retired in 1933, who had completely withdrawn from academia. Now 77, he resumed great activity in Heidelberg and in public. With his books "Abschied von der bisherigen Geschichte" (1946) and "Der dritte oder der vierte Mensch" (1953), he sought to interpret the catastrophes of recent history from a universal history and cultural sociology viewpoint as an epoch-making break with the past. He saw the danger of a "type shift" in humanity, brought about by the mental attitude of "pragmatic Nihilism" and by bureaucratic unfreedom. The experiences of the First World War, National Socialism, mass annihilation in the concentration camps and finally the terror of the atom bomb, had produced a wide-spread awareness of a permanent change. In this connection mention might also be made of the universal history and cultural philosophy treatments by Karl Jaspers, Vom Ursprung und Ziel der Geschichte (1949), Alexander Rüstow, Ortsbestimmung der Gegenwart (1951 - 1957), Alfred Müller-Armack, Diagnose unserer Gegenwart (1949) and Hans Freyer, Weltgeschichte Europas (1948) and Theorie des gegenwärtigen Zeitalters (1955). For Alfred Weber these historical reflections stood in the same line as his view of sociology as the interpretation of the whole historical "life aggregations" brought about by the factors of social structure, civilization and culture, as set out by him in 1935 in his book "Kulturgeschichte als Kultursoziologie", and presented again in his Einführung in die Soziologie (1955). Sociology was to analyse the fate of humanity in the context of

sociological conditions, to work out the constellations in terms of universal history, were it not to run the danger of specialist, causalist and typological "bloodlessness", and of "producing sociological formalism"[9]. Along with Alexander Rüstow, who in 1949 came back from emigration in Turkey, Hans von Eckardt, who got back his professorship in publicistics from which he had been dismissed in 1933, and the economists Herbert Sultan and Erich Preiser, Alfred Weber influenced for a further 10 years a specific intellectual milieu in Heidelberg. Following his death in 1958, Rüstow's retirement in 1955 and the deaths of Eckardt and Herbert Sultan in 1957, this resumption of "Heidelberg sociology" came to an end. The highly personal conceptualization and convictions on which Alfred Weber's analyses and insights were based were not transferable from himself to pupils; the categories and frames of references were too indefinite and ambivalent for this[10].

Among the representatives of the twenties was also Alfred Vierkandt at the Humbold University in Berlin, already 78 in 1945, and Richard Thurnwald, who changed to the Free University and was 76 by the end of the war. Both worked for only a few years more; they died in 1953 and 1954. Also of note is Alfred von Martin, who in 1933 had voluntarily stepped down from his post as honorary professor in Göttingen and after the war, at 63, again began more than 12 years of teaching activity in Munich. Besides his work in social and cultural history, he had in little-noticed contributions in 1954 and 1955 presented a comprehensive description of economic sociology, family and youth sociology, sociology of government and cultural sociology[11]. They represent, as it were, the final statement of German sociology of the twenties, at the distance of 20 years. Also in Munich, Fedor Stepun worked from 1947 on, when he was 63; from

1926 until his dismissal in 1937 he had occupied one of the few chairs in sociology (at the TH Dresden). He devoted himself primarily to themes form Russian intellectual history and sociology of art.

Among the bearers of the tradition were also a number of economists who in the first post-war years did sociology part-time, as had also been the case before 1933. Among these were notably Friedrich Bülow (FU Berlin), Georg Jahn (TH Berlin), Erwin von Beckerath (Bonn), Georg Weippert (Erlangen), Heinz Sauermann (Frankfurt), Alexander Rüstow (Heidelberg), Eric von Sievers (TH Stuttgart), Carl Brinkmann (Tübingen) and Walter Taeuber (Würzburg). While their work enabled sociology to be represented at several universities soon after the war, they were unable to excert any lasting influence on the refoundation of sociology. The mixture they offered of economic theory and sociology was rapidly separated out, both because of the development of economics towards econometrics, and by that of sociology, which increasingly isolated social behaviour from economic contexts. The divergent development of the two disciplines has often been complained of, and mediation between them has since no longer been crowned with success.

Thus, sociology in the first post-war years was revived by the representatives of a generation born between 1865 and 1885, who had survived national socialism and the war in Germany and was routed in the liberal traditions of the twenties. The restrictions in the period before the currency reform gave them little opportunity; nevertheless, it is they who are to be thanked for the impetus for the refoundation of sociology, even if they were

not able to have much impact on its content.

III. The Refoundation: 1950 to 1955

In the fifties, sociology in the Federal Republic was refounded. In was in that decade that the institutionalization of chairs of sociology in the universities took place, along with the introduction of a major course of studies, the training of the first post-war generation of German sociologists, the setting up of research institutions and the development of a different conceptualization of sociology, which set the course until the end of the sixties.

Initially, it was the setting up of full professorships that occupied the attention (see Table 3). The obstacles to a rapid integration of sociology into the universities' departments were considerable. They were based in part on faculties' reservations regarding sociology; in part they resulted from the government authorities'[12] placing reconstruction of the universities before the extension of the faculties in the budget; in part they were due to the lack of qualified academics, which could not be overcome even by the return of emigrés. The institutionalization of sociology was mostly carried through quicker where sociological chairs or seminars had existed before 1933. Arguments from continuation or from reintroduction of the status quo seemed to have more readily overcome the reservations about sociology.

In Cologne, following von Wiese's retirement, his chair for economics and sociology was split, leaving a new separate sociology chair to fill. The choice went

in 1949 to René König, who had emigrated to Switzerland, took the Habiltation there in 1938 and since systematically taught sociology in Zürich, though no institutional resources were available to him there. In Hamburg too a chair in sociology already existed, vacant since Andreas Walther's retirement in 1944/45. This professorship went in 1951 to Siegfried Landshut, who returned from Palestine, but soon turned to political science. The sociology position was then taken over in 1953 by Helmut Schelsky, who had been teaching sociology as full professor in Hamburg since 1948, at the newly set up Academy for Gemeinwirtschaft.

In Frankfurt, a centre for sociology before 1933, there was a double institutional tradition: Karl Mannheim's chair in the faculty of economics and social science, and the Institut für Sozialforschung set up from foundation funds in 1923, with the chair of its director Max Horkheimer in the philosophical faculty. In 1949, Max Horkheimer resumed the chair he had been expelled from in 1933. The old legal titles of the foundation for the Institut für Sozialforschung were reactivated, and in 1950 it became possible to set up the Institut again. To be sure, not all former members of the institute returned from emigration; along with Max Horkheimer there were only his two friends Friedrich Pollock and Theodor W. Adorno. Nor was the Institute's journal revived. The chair in the faculty of economics and social science was not occupied until 1957, by Julius Kraft, who had before 1933 been a senior lecturer in Frankfurt and had emigrated to the United States via Holland.

At the Nuremberg Handelshochschule, Max Rumpf's chair was, following

several years of vacancy, again occupied by a sociologist, in 1951 - 1953, in the person of Werner Ziegenfuss, who had managed to take a Habilitation in 1941 at the College of Economics in Berlin. In 1955 the chair was again filled by Karl Valentin Müller, who until the end of the war had occupied a chair at the German University in Prague. In Berlin, Otto Stammer in the faculty of economics and social science (1951) and in 1955 Hans Joachim Lieber in the philosophical faculty (1955) obtained newly created professorships in sociology. Both had collaborated on setting up the Free University, and had taught sociology even before their appointments. In Kiel, where Ferdinand Tönnies worked, a chair in sociology, social sciences and statistics was set up and occupied by Gerhard Mackenroth from 1948 until his early death in 1955. Mackenroth had already been professor of economics in Kiel from 1934 to 1941, paying special attention to population theory and social policy.

The professorship in sociology and philosophy set up in Göttingen in 1951 had been created ad personam for Helmut Plessner, who had taught from 1935 onwards at the University of Groningen, having taken his Habilitation in philosophy at Cologne in 1920.

At Freiburg, Arnold Bergstraesser secured in 1954 a professorship in political science and sociology. He had taught German Cultural History in the USA from 1937 to 1953 and had been working as visiting professor in Germany since 1950.

In the second half of the fifties, only a few further chairs were created. One was a professorship in Mainz, obtained by Wilhelm E. Mühlmann, who had been teaching since 1950 there as associate professor. Another was a professorship in Mannheim at the then College of Economics, filled by Eduard Baumgarten, who had till the

end of the war been Professor of Philosophy in Königsberg: another a chair in Munich, to which Emerich Francis was called in 1958. He had become a sociologist in America in the forties, and was now returning from emigration. However, these developments were no longer decisive for post-war sociology in Germany.

Further mention should be made of new developments outside the traditional universities. At the new university of the Saar, which till 1957 was outside the territory of the Federal Republic, a professorship in sociology was set up. The Belgian sociologist Georges Goriely taught there from 1953 to around 1962. The academy for administrative science in Speier had already in 1947 offered Arnold Gehlen, who before 1945 had had a professorship of philosophy in Königsberg and then in Vienna, a new base under the banner of sociology. The Academy for Social (Gemeinwirtschaft) Economics founded in Hamburg in 1948 obtained a professorship in sociology, first occupied by Helmut Schelsky, which later served a number of younger sociologists as a jumping-off point. Another post-war foundation, the College of Labour, Politics and Economics in Wilhelmshaven, also had a professorship in sociology, filled in 1949 by Max Ernst Graf Solms.

The development of sociology reached by 1955 in universities in the Federal Republic was on the whole modest. Nevertheless, 12 chairs had been set up, which more or less corresponded to the state of affairs in 1932. The process of institutionalization took place with no overall concept of university or academic policy, was influenced essentially by local situations, and to that extent was more random than systematic. After the war sociology received no special promotion, nor was any separate teaching or educational task assigned to it. It was established as an optional subject on the margin of the faculty to which it was

attached, often separated by faculty boundaries from neighbouring fields of study, and left on its own.

By contrast with the Weimar period, sociology was no longer associated with the idea of a synthesizing science intended to serve political education, or with a special task within the studium generale that was very much promoted in the post-war years[13]. Efforts at re-education and at promoting democratic perceptions benefited the institutionalization of political science much more[14]. In 1950, the General Assembly of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie demanded in a resolution that the expansion of political science not take place at the expense of sociology, since: "the creation of equivalent research and teaching possibilities for general and empirical sociology is among the prerequisites for the promotion of political science, since it is in these sociological disciplines that the major portion of the knowledge and insights on which the study of politics as a science must be based has to be worked out[15]". Nevertheless, the development of sociology as a university discipline was on the whole not seriously restricted by the expansion of political science and its internal consolidation as a science was if anything presumably even facilitated by its marginal position in the training of social studies teachers.

Stress must be laid on the relatively important research capacity built up in the fifties outside the universities. It considerably encouraged the development of empirical social research in the phase of refoundation of sociology, and at the same time offered the academic successor generation a chance at qualification.

For the first post-war generation, experience gained there was of great importance. A few institutes characteristic of this period will briefly be mentioned below.

With support from the Rockefeller Foundation, the Dortmund Centre for Social Research was set up in 1946 at the University of Münster, in part linking up existing institutions with new research departments for industrial and occupational sociology, community sociology and Sociography. The Social Research Centre developed in the fifties into an important sociological research institute, with empirical studies in industrial sociology and community sociology to the fore. Among those working as directors in Dortmund were: Otto Neuloh, who came from labour administration (1946 - 1961), Wilhelm Brepohl, who since 1935 had directed the Research Centre for Ethnicity in the Ruhr, Carl Jantke, who had been able to take a Habilitation as late as 1939 in Königsberg and who devoted himself especially to social history (1949 - 1953), Gunter Ipsen, who at the end of the war had lost his chair in Vienna and was later retired from Münster (1951-1961). For shorter periods, Elisabeth Pfeil (1952-1955) and Hans Linde (1957-1959) also worked in the Social Research Centre. Probably the most valued academic contribution among the social research centres were the studies by Heinrich Popitz, Hans Paul Bahrdt, Ernst August Jüres and Hanno Kesting, carried out in 1953 and 1954 on the problem of technical and social influences on industrial work in the iron and steel industry. They belong today among the studies in German post-war sociology that have become regarded as classics[16]. In the sixties, the Social Research Centre was no longer able to provide any great stimulation for the development of sociology, though many of those who were then taking Habilitation

in Münster were able to find jobs there.

On the initiative of Nels Anderson, then a civilian official of the American military government, the Darmstadt Institute for Social Science Research was set up in 1949. It was to make the methods of empirical social research known in Germany and study the living conditions of the working class. From it developed the so-called Darmstadt study, the results of which were presented unfortunately only incompletely in a series of monographs. This institute was loosely connected with the Academy of Labour in Frankfurt, and could be financed for only some four years. It was representative of the spirit of initiative, combined with inadequate institutionalization, of many then research institutions[17].

UNESCO too supported the expansion of research, by setting up three institutes to promote areas regarded as underdeveloped. Beside the institutes for youth research in Hamburg and the Institute of Social Work in Gauting near Munich, it supported from 1951 to 1958 the UNESCO Institute for Social Sciences in Cologne. Among those who worked here were Erich Reigrotzki (1951-1957), Renate Mayntz (1953-1957) and Gerhard Wurzbacher (1952-1954). Noteworthy productions of this institute were two studies that have since become classics: the so-called Euskirchen-Study by Renate Mayntz and the first major population survey, analysed by Erich Reigrotzki.[18]

Of the many other institutes newly founded in the late forties and early fifties, none had comparable effects. Most of them

closed again after a few years[19]. By contrast, the new opinion research institutes continued to be important, to the extent that they could secure lasting finance from the market following the currency reforms. Special mention here should go to the Emnid-Institute in Bielefeld (1945), the Institue for Demoscopy in Allensbach (1947) and DIVO in Frankfurt (1951). The rapid development of survey research was an important stimulus to the long-term development of social research, even though this took place largely outside academically constituted sociology[20].

At individual universities too, research capacity was developed through research contracts and third-party funds, notably in Cologne, Frankfurt, Berlin and Göttingen, but even in the fifties it was no longer possible to integrate large research institutes into the universities[21]. Sociology was institutionalized in the universities on the pattern of the humanities, and constantly had to justify expansion through teaching work. When this later rapidly increased at the end of the sixties, the lack of research capacity in the universities became a serious structural problem of acadmic sociology[22].

By the mid-fifties the basic pattern of post-war sociology had formed. It was determined by the four newly created centres in Berlin, Frankfurt, Cologne and Hamburg, with other centres in Freiburg and Göttingen. At all these places, sociology had a character of its own, determined by the occupant of the chair. These all came from a small group of people, being Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno in Frankfurt, Helmut Plessner in Göttingen, René König in Cologne, Arnold Bergstraesser in Freiburg, Helmut Schlesky in Hamburg and Otto Stammer in Berlin. Those named were

born mainly between 1895 and 1906, with only Plessner being somewhat older (born 1892) and Schelsky younger (born 1912). They were politically and academically socialized in the period between the First World War and the end of the Weimar Republic, and were moulded by the experience of National Socialism. Most had returned from emigration; thus Adorno, Bergstraesser, Horkheimer, König, and Plessner. Stammer too had managed only after the war to begin an academic career. Only Schelsky had secured a professorship in Germany before the end of the war (at the Reich University of Strasburg in 1943), which however he could not exercise in view of his military service. With the exception of Otto Stammer, all came to sociology from a study of philosophy, and therefore stand in the philosophical tradition of sociology in Germany and not the legal or economic one. Together, in the fifties they supported a strategy seeking to establish sociology as an independent, professionalizing discipline, and for all the disparity in academic interests and political orientations they promoted empirical research. It would seem justified to treat them together as the founding generation of post-war sociology, even if in biography, values and mutual controversies they are anything but a homogeneous group.

lV. The Situation in the Fifties

The post-war situation in sociology in the Federal Republic represented by the founding generation embraced very diverse views on the content and tasks of sociology. These ideas can be no more than briefly sketched here.

In Cologne, René König developed a sociology which in his frequently quoted phrase sought to be 'nothing but sociology'; a sociology

conceived deliberately as an empirical separate science stressing empirical social research and promoting the adoption of international developments. König became the most prominent exponent of the programme of an internationally oriented sociology grounded both theoretically and methodologically. As editor of the Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie and of important handbooks he devoted great effort to developing this sociology[24]. In the twenties, König had started by reading oriental studies, then philosophy (under Max Dessoir) and ethnology (under Thurnwald), as well as sociology (under Vierkandt)[25]. Via his ethnological interests, he came to the Durkheim school, promoting its acceptance in Germany through a number of publications. He likewise strove for a broad penetration of recent American sociology, especially structural functionalism. König also supported the establishment of the International Sociological Association, which he chaired from 1962 to 1966. Practically all younger sociologists who studied in Cologne were "internationalized" through him and no longer continued specifically German intellectual trends. König himself retained from the thirties a deliberate aloofness towards the Left and Right Hegelian philosophers of history and his stress on empirical social research resulted partly from the endeavour to strengthen the traditions of rational enlightenment in Germany[26]. He promoted empirical social research in Cologne through numerous research groups, among which a large part of the post-war generation of sociologists was recruited. His own interests went towards systematic family sociology, various aspects of contemporary culture and later again to ethnological topics. He represented a sociology which, as an analytical and empirical separate science, was soon sharply distinguished from broader conceptions of sociology, as developed notably in Frankfurt.

The "New Frankfurt School" of Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno represents an independent trend in post-war sociology. It is the interesting case of direct transmission of social and philosophical conceptualizations from the Weimar period into the Federal Republic, a bridge in tradition that cannot be found with comparable homogeneity in the area of sociology.

In the case of the so-called Frankfurt school, no break in tradition was brought about by National Socialism. The "critical theory" was formulated in the twenties, kept to through the experiences of National Socialism and emigration to the US, and turned against a theory of sociology as an empirical separate science. It laid claim to a broad spectrum of thought on the totality of society, through the hermeneutic elucidation of the anthropologically possible. Highly sublime interpretations of social and especially cultural phenomena attracted great attention far beyond the world of academic sociology, especially among culturally critical intellectuals. A unique milieu came into being, with a highly personalized concentration round Horkheimer, and later particularly round Adorno, which still had the nature of a "school" in the 19th-century sense and continued to exist into the late sixties.

Horkheimer and Adorno had dealt first of all with Husserl, and then especially with Marx, Hegel and Lukács, responding also to Freud, though without themselves becoming Marxists or Freudians in an orthodox sense. This cooperative formulation of ideas is a phenomenon of academic history the uniqueness of which can only be emphasized here but not further studied[27]. The views of the "critical theory" brought to post-war sociology a characteristic tension. Mention may first be made of the dialectical relation-

ship they stressed between theory and empirical observations. Horkheimer and Adorno stressed on the one hand the need for empirical social research, and the institute they directed in Frankfurt also became a vehicle for continuing empirical research. But there was a peculiar ambivalence towards empirical social research, which was looked down on as naive or as a self-anaesthetising "duplication of reality". Theory was assigned an autonomous power of insight, vis-à-vis the mere facts. Sociology was to be kept in tension "between the philosophical concept, without which sociology can in no way manage to grasp its object, society, and empirical discovery, without the demythologizing resistance of which towards loose thinking thought about society becomes the more condemned to powerlessness the more it puts on grandiose airs"[29]. The discussions carried on under the name of the so-called positivism dispute had already begun in the fifties, even though they were not to be fully developed till the next generation of sociologists, in the person of Jürgen Habermas and Hans Albert[30].

Horkheimer and Adorno sought to give post-war sociology in Germany the function of being an institution for thinking about "a society alienated from itself" [31]. The Frankfurt school was therefore moderately critical of American sociology, or even rejected it, using selected Marxist and Freudian categories as the theoretical basis for social analysis of the present[32]. At the forefront of interest were, however, cultural phenomena and questions of consciousness formation, whereby the cultural industry and the bureaucracy were specially stressed as agents, and socialization as the process whereby consciousness was formed. On the other hand, the economic and political structure of the Federal Republic remained insufficiently analysed. The question of the chances for individual autonomy in an administered world was at the centre of interest in the sixties as much as it had been in the twenties. This rather

cultural-criticism concept of sociology, and the scepticism against non-mediated practical reference for social critical reflection were aimed at preventing empirical sociology to become separated from historical and philosophical thinking on the totality of human existence[33].

In Hamburg, Helmut Schelsky carried on work that soon received considerable public attention. His interest lay in researching current problems of the day in post-war society. While he was working at the Akademie für Gemeinwirtschaft he ran a research project on unemployment and its social consequences among youth, which was followed by his widely read books on the post-war family and the so-called sceptical generation. He went on to concern himself with the functional change of higher education, with the social consequences of automation and with sexuality[34]. Schelsky had in the early thirties studied under Freyer and Gehlen and worked on Fichte and Hobbes. After the experience of war, "abstract philosophical, particularly idealistic, thought" seemed to him to have lost from under it "the firm ground of direct and certain experience of the world". Sociology became for him "the search for reality", the study of social situations "before they are normatively processed or generalized as ideas"[35]. His attitude towards empirical social research as a means of reorientation in the newly forming society is characteristic for the post-war period. Schelsky describes this situation himself: "the rise of empirical sociology after 1945 in West Germany derives its importance primarily from an anti-ideological need for reality and orientation... following a social and political catastrophe that shook our society to its foundations, overturned all ordinary social relations and must be seen as being caused by ideological failure to recognise reality and by betrayal

through ideas"[36]. In the first "manual and text book on modern sociology" edited by Schelsky along with Gehlen, this is put as follows in the preliminary remarks "the present stage of development of our science justifies the avoidance of premature systematization or of anything that might be called theory... an 'overall' theory cannot for the moment be offered"[37]. The absence of theory noted here has, to be sure, nothing to do with the international state of development of sociology, but results from the fact that neither the adoption of modern theory nor the linkage with the specifically sociological theories of German sociology before National Socialism had taken place. Schelsky himself encouraged neither of these processes, and consistently, in 1965, made his "farewell to a type of sociological research and teaching whose social and academic importance is in my view coming to an end"[38]. Schelsky at that time saw the end of the first phase of post-war sociology in the development of mathematical and statistical methods and the expanding of explicit theories, i.e. in the emergence of a consolidating separate subject. By contrast, in a 1959 article on the "destination of German sociology", he sketched out his own position: the development of a "transcendental theory of society", a reflection by sociological thinkers on the "concept of the world and of existence" contained in sociological thought, and thereby a critique of sociology based on the metasociological assumptions of philosophical anthropology. It was not till 1975 that he sought to carry out the programme formulated in 1959, in an "anti-sociology" which "doubted and rejected" sociology "as a scientific subject pure and simple, because of its non-scientific effects"[39]. Schelsky's concepts of sociology were critically discussed in 1960 by Ralf Dahrendorf[40], who referred particularly to the lessened appreciation of empirical research as mere "social historiography of the present",

as theoretically unmediated description of facts, and to the avoidance of sociological theory in favour of metasociological, philosophical and anthropological reflection on the social conditions of human existence.

Despite this ambivalent attitude, Schelsky did apply himself to the development and institutional expansion of sociology. Around the mid-fifties, he contributed significantly to the activation of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie, bringing into being within it a special committee on university and study matters, intended to plan and coordinate the teaching and training functions; in 1955 he organized in Hamburg a meeting of north German young sociologists that was to remain the only one, and following his move to Münster, more sociologists took Habilitations there in the decade from 1961 to 1970 than during the whole post-war period at any other German university. It should finally be recalled that the then sole and still largest faculty of sociology in Germany, at Bielefeld, was conceived and seen through to full institutionalization by him. Thus, Schelsky was one of the most influential founders of post-war sociology, although from the viewpoints of both academic theory and cultural policy he basically rejected the development of analytical, empirical sociology.

In Berlin, sociology developed at the Free University under the active leadership of Otto Stammer. He was a pupil of Hermann Heller, and represented those social scientists from the Weimar Republic who had been more closely linked with the labour movement, only a few of whom returned from emigration. From this schooling, he turned in particular to political sociology, which he systematically encouraged both in the Sociological Institute and in the inter-disciplinary Institute for Political Science, of

which he had become director in 1954. He linked sociology with political science in a manner which for the fifties was unique. This should be stressed particularly because sociology otherwise scarecely concerned itself directly with political issues. Neither the collapse of the Weimar Republic and the National Socialist regime nor developments in the DDR and the problems of a split Germany interested sociologists in the Federal Republic, and even the structure of the new democratic order in the Federal Republic was not taken as a field for sociological research. In view of this reticence before issues from the field of political sociology, the research into elections, parties, associations and trade unions called for by Stammer was an important contribution towards the development of sociological research. Stammer's importance as a mediator between the disciplines of sociology and of political science was all the more important because the two disciplines were developing side by side without any close relationships. At the refoundation of the Deutsche Hochschule für Politik in Berlin in 1948, no faculty representation of sociology was provided for, and at the universities the two disciplines were frequently institutionalized in different faculties and not involved in any joint teaching tasks. Political science was established as part of teacher training, whereas sociology remained more closely linked with the economics. This separate, poorly matched development led to an underdevelopment of institutional analysis in sociology and in political science of the behavioural analysis of political processes as against the description of institutions. Stammer's efforts in Berlin were not able to put a stop to this general trend[41].

In Freiburg too, Arnold Bergstraesser's chair in political science and

sociology linked the two disciplines. Bergstraesser's interest lay, however, primarily in establishing political science as a specialized subject in civics courses in secondary education. Of sociological importance were above all his efforts at developing the study of developing countries, which in Freiburg had a sociologically oriented emphasis. Bergstraesser represented a tradition of cultural sociology that linked up with Eberhard Gothein and Alfred Weber from Heidelberg, and from which Bergstraesser had, as long ago as the early thirties, turned towards the study of foreign countries. The expansion of the research area encouraged by him admittedly remained without lasting theoretical or conceptual effect on the development of sociology as a whole. This is also true of the tradition of ethnosociology of Richard Thurnwald, continued by Wilhelm E. Mühlmann. The schools of cultural anthropology from Britain and the US were only slightly taken up in Germany. The study of post-war West German society was at the center of interest, and historical or international comparative studies going beyond that took second place. Since, furthermore, cultural anthropology in the Anglo-Saxon sense did not manage to develop systematically in Germany, the development of sociology was marked from its beginnings by a certain provincialism, which it has not yet overcome today. The impulses provided by Bergstraesser and Mühlmann sought to work against this.

In Göttingen Helmut Plessner was called to a new chair in sociology and philosophy in 1952. Plessner had studied biology and philosophy, and had turned to philosophical anthropology under the stimulus of Hans Driesch's natural philosophy and Edmund Husserl's phenomenology. From 1920 to 1933 he taught philosophy in Cologne, beside Max Scheler. In 1934 he had to emigrate to Holland, survived persecution there during the occupation and was now in Göttingen presenting sociology

and philosophy as mutually mediated through anthropological and historical approaches[42]. The sociological seminar he directed began in 1952 an empirical and statistical study on the situation of German University teachers[43], which was followed by work on adult education and on the development of the town of Wolfsburg. Plessner's own interests were directed towards questions of cultural sociology and social philosophy[44]. He concentrated on the connection between philosophy and sociology, against the prevalence of empirical and contemporary research on facts which he feared, and chaired both the Allgemeine Gesellschaft für Philosophie and the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie. His period of office as president of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie from 1955 to 1959 saw the opening up of the society to a younger generation of sociologists and the development of the Sociological Congresses from conversations among scholars from various disciplines into congresses of specialized sociologists. For Plessner, sociology's most important task as a subject lay in enlightening and criticizing an ideologically closed society. The constant threat to freedom from totalitarian systems necessitated "permanent institutionalized vigilance over social relations, with critical intent and in academic form"[45]. Plessner was therefore also in agreement with the post-war call for sociology in Germany to show a particular obligation towards educating and criticizing social relationships in view of the experiences of National Socialism.

By around the end of the fifties, sociology was again solidly established at several universities. Nevertheless, there was a widespread feeling of dissatisfaction with the state of the discipline. This dissatisfaction was expressed by the founder generation and shared also by the younger sociologists. It is possible

here only to sketch briefly the most important positions in the debate of the times on the state of sociology[46].

The first striking thing is that most representatives of the founder generation were highly ambivalent towards empirical social research. Only René König unambiguously stood for a viewpoint that saw empirical social research as an integral part of the development of systems of sociological statements and called systematically for the adoption of modern methodology. Otherwise, while an important function was assigned to empirical research, whether as a corrective to the formation of ideology (Adorno), as the factual description of contemporary society (Schelsky), or as a demonstration of the lack of validity of norms (Plessner), it was nevertheless on the whole seen as secondary and merely supplementary by comparison with historical and philosophical thinking about human existence. It was this ambivalence that explains the rather surprising warnings against over-emphasis on empirical research, though at the time it was little done and was methodologically still largely amateurish. From the beginning, then, there was a more defensive than encouraging attitude of academic sociology towards empirical social research, which had a retarding effect on the development of sociology as a whole. The second leitmotif in the expressions of dissatisfaction is the widely bewailed lack of theory. But here too the expression "theory deficit" meant very different things. Some used the expression to mean a lack of "sociological theories" in the narrower sense ((König). Others however meant more a perceived lack of a "theory of the present age", a reflection of individual subjectivity that transcended sociology under the conditions of the institutional compulsions of society (Schelsky), or the limited effect of specific statements of the philosophy of

history regarding the meaning of social phenomena for the development of man, a "theory of society" (Adorno), or finally a mere regret that the time of big systems and comprehensive theoretical outlines in sociology had come to an end (Mühlmann). The consequences drawn from this complaint were extremely diverse. Only René König unambiguously advocated both the reworking and further development of the classical theories of sociology, especially those of Durkheim, but also Tönnies and Weber, as well as for the adoption of the more modern "mid-range" theories of structural functionalism. But for sociology in the fifties, there is no recognizable broad linkage with the classical theories, not any systematic recourse to the modern approaches[47]. Thus, Dahrendorf, as a representative of the younger sociologists, concludes that there is a lack of verifiable models, whether to explain specific problems or to analyse whole societies.

The refoundation of sociology after the war can be characterized as an unmediated co-existence of positions that had been formulated in the twenties, the "critical"theory, philosophical anthropology and phenomenology, which in turn had already either ignored or else taken up only extremely selectively the sociology of Weber or Durkheim or Marx, plus a largely unreflective adoption of the more recent individual findings of American research. In part, this was the consequence of the selectiveness of the transposition of sociology from the twenties. Representatives of empirical and systematic sociology like Theodor Geiger (died 1952) and Rudolf Heberle; people like Hans Gerth, who played an important part in getting Weber taken up in America, or Karl Mannheim (died 1947) did not come back to Germany[48]. Finally, it should be pointed out that the Viennese tradition of theory of science (Karl R. Popper) and

empirical social research (Paul Lazarsfeld) had scarcely been taken up in the Federal Republic in the fifties. One may if one wishes see in the situation of those times an openness that made the study of sociology, for younger people, into a largely uncodified and intellectually stimulating undertaking. There was no "dominant school", no binding standards; instead there was a motivating conviction of the enlightening effect of sociology, accompanied by scepticism as to its technological serviceability.

The different views in respect to theory science and to the tasks of science among the founding generation soon led to largish material and personal tensions. These were sparked off by the intention of the Confédération Internationale de Sociologie, a successor organization to the Institut International de Sociologie of prewar times, to hold an international congress in Nuremberg in 1958. Controversy turned round two points. One was fear of competition by the Confédération with the newly founded International Sociological Association as the sole international organization for sociology, and at the same time rejection of the German section of the Confédération as a competitor for the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soz Of greater importance was the circumstance that those who belonged to the German section of the Confédération and supported the International Congress in Nuremberg were mainly people who had held academic positions in Germany during the Third Reich, most notably the president of the German section, Hans Freyer, and the then Secretary General of the Confédération, Karl Valentin Müller, who had held a chair in Nuremberg since 1955, which was why the Congress was to be located there. There thus developed in the late fifties a conflict opposing the émigrés and those who had

remained in office in Germany and in the course of time resumed their professorial positions like Karl Valentin Müller in Nuremberg Karl Heinz Pfeffer, Gunther Ipsen and Hans Freyer in Münster. The controvercies of those times led to large personal tensions, exacerbated by the fact that Helmut Schelsky felt compelled to leave the executive of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie and not to take part in the 1959 Berlin Sociological Congress. The paper he did not deliver in Berlin was the basis for his book on the present state of German sociology. The new president of the Gesellschaft, Otto Stammer, sought to overcome the differences of opinion that had arisen in internal discussion in October 1960. Members of the executive were invited to a meeting in the hotel Jagdschloss Niederwald, along with leading representatives of the various positions: Adorno and Horkheimer, König, Freyer, Gehlen, Schelsky and Jantke as well as Bergstraesser, Mühlmann and Plessner. It was not possible to achieve personal mediation between the positions, so that the attempt was made to objectivize the personal controversies in scholarly, theoretical debate. This debate took place at the internal working session of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie in Tübingen in 1961, with the two papers on the logic of the social sciences by Karl R. Popper and Theodor W. Adorno[49].

The foundation situation broke up at the end of the fifties. The 14th Sociological Congress, held in 1959, marks the transition to a new phase of development. While the previous 13th Sociological Congress in Bad Meinberg had still taken the form of a discussion circle for scholars from various disciplines - at least half the lectures were given by non-sociologists - the 14th Sociological Congress for the first time appeared as a specialist congress within which the sections of the Gesellschaft that

had in the meantime been formed appeared with their own programmes and met with great interest. Younger sociologists appeared for the first time in any numbers at that congress. The first Habilitations and appointments had taken place (cf. Tables 3 and 4), and three representatives of this younger generation were elected to the executive of the society in Berlin (Hans-Paul Bahrdt, Ralf Dahrendorf and Heinrich Popitz). transition from the "founding generation" to the "post-war generation" was thereby introduced.

V. The Incorporation of Sociology into the Universitites.

The development of sociology was very much determined by the nature of its incorporation into the universities. In the fifties and sixties a large part was played here by its assignment to faculties, with the boundaries thereby drawn between different disciplines. In view of the dual tradition of sociology, coming from philosophy on the one hand and economics and political science on the other, the first chairs are to be found in the faculties of both philosophy and economics, with professors in some cases being assigned to two faculties[50]. This gave rise to special problems. Depending on the faculty assignment, there were different conditions for the study of sociology, which made the formation of sociology into a major subject difficult. In the economics faculties, sociology was confined to the function of an optional subject in diploma courses for economists and in business studies. The possibility of proceding to a doctorate was dependent on taking an economics degree. In the philosophical faculties, while a doctorate could be taken directly without a previous exam, (so far as sociology was admitted as a major subject), the study of sociology could be combined only with those disciplines that also belonged to the philosophy

faculty. Since the study of sociology can in principle be reasonably combined with a number of other disciplines, notably with economics, psychology, ethnology, geology, political science, but also with history, philosophy, and areas of law and the humanities, any one-sided assignment to a faculty constitutes a specific restriction on the development of sociology. Since sociology was most frequently institutionalized within the economics faculties, it remained dependent for its development directly on the organization of study in these faculties. This, however, meant an institutionally forced option between the status of a mere minor subject within the economic sciences, with the exclusion of all disciplines from the philosophy faculty as study areas, or else the setting up of a separate degree course which would both raise the status of sociology to that of a major subject and permit the inclusion of other study areas of a non-economic nature. The continually discussed question whether sociology should be a "minor subject par excellence" or a major subject with a degree of its own was grounded not so much on decisions of principle in favour of one or the other, but in the institutional dilemma in which sociology found itself and the attempts to escape therefrom through pragmatic solutions.

Sociology had been in principle in the same situation even in the Weimar Republic. In 1926 the general assembly of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie had called for sociology to be admitted with the status of a major subject at all academic examinations, particularly those for economics degrees, and not merely as a supplementary minor subject. But developments ran counter to this. In Prussia, from 1929 onwards, sociology could be chosen only as a

supplementary subject in the examination for the degree in economics. The narrowing of the scope of economics that was already taking place offered sociology no possibilities of expansion. In 1932 the situation was again discussed at a lecturers' session of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie. It was found that the increasing tendency to turn universities into something too much like schools was hindering the inclusion of sociology in curricula and that it would be possible to develop sociology as a major subject only if it were possible to give students access to courses in it leading to some meaningful degree. A special degree in sociology was not yet called for, but a new doctorate in Social Sciences was to make possible at post-graduate level a major study course in sociology with free options for other disciplines[51]. Karl Mannheim developed a curriculum for such a major course in sociology. It was to cover general sociology, social history as cultural sociology (or the emergence and change of social institutions) and structural analysis of contemporary society. To this obligatory core, three optional complements were to be added: one in a political and legal, one in an economic and one in a historical and philosophical direction[52]. This was intended to give those graduating qualifications for various occupational areas. These efforts were to remain without result since shortly thereafter sociology as a whole succumbed, with the National Socialist seizure of power.

After the war the position was no different. In economics the development of sociology was restricted; in the philosophical faculty it was separated from other social sciences; legal disciplines remained inaccessible. The question again arose of improving the position of sociology within economics faculties, or else developing a separate one. Priority was given to the first option,

but this was just as hard to introduce generally after the war as it had been before it. The same decision was therefore arrived at as in 1932, namely in favour of a separate study course, but with the call for a degree course rather than a purely post-graduate one.

In 1952 in Frankfurt, a project for a separate degree course in social sciences had been worked out, and at a conference on the structure of education in the social sciences held in Cologne from 6 to 8 March 1953 the setting up of a degree course in sociology was discussed and its main outlines decided[53]. This is all the more surprising because at that time sociology was still in the first phase of reconstruction. New efforts were pushed forward by the sociologists in Frankfurt, particularly Friedrich Pollock and Max Horkheimer, but also Alexander Rüstow and Otto Stammer. The economists present supported these endeavours, no doubt from the standpoint that tighter inclusion of sociology in economics degree courses was undesirable or unachievable. This was the start of a road that was eventually to be fully travelled: to make the study of sociology independent of economics on the one hand, and to codify a curriculum in place of the free choices allowed in degree courses in the philosophical faculties. The decision was justified on the assumption that the possibility would create its own demand and that the introduction of a degree exam in sociology would also be followed by the opening up of job possibilities. The decisions were however motivated not by considerations on vocational opportunities but by the developmental restrictions that sociology was facing in the universities. The most important factor was the existence of degree qualified economists, both as a model and as an obstacle to an alternative arrangement of sociological study courses.

The first ordinances on examinations for a degree in sociology

appeared in 1955 in Frankfurt and in 1956 in Berlin. In Frankfurt the following examination subjects were specified: theoretical sociology; empirical social research; political science; economics; one optional subject. In Berlin there was an obligatory core of general sociology, a special sociology, and methods of empirical social research, supplemented by either an economics option with as subjects economics business administration and one optional subject) or by a philosophical option (the subjects being psychology and social phsychology, political science or modern history or journalism, and one optional subject). In both cases admission to studies leading to doctorates in philosophy or political science was made dependent on passing the degree examination. The College of Economics and Social Science in Nuremberg and the College of Social Science in Wilhelmshaven set up new courses for a diploma in social economics in 1956, with sociology as one of six examination subjects. While sociology had thereby gained the status of a major subject, it nevertheless in view of the extensive study material from other disciplines remained something less than a major subject. The way was at least pointed out, towards incorporating sociological disciplines into new economics and social science courses.

The Deutsche Gesellschaft
für Soziologie again tried in 1955 to have sociology brought in as a major subject into the study of economics, recommending the introduction of degrees in economics with a social science emphasis.

But the Economics and Social Science Association rejected any change in the examination arrangements for qualified economists, so that this option for the incorporation of the study of sociology as a

major subject into existing examination arrangements failed. It was only at the University of Cologne that a degree course in economics with a sociological emphasis was introduced.

With the renewed failure of the alternative, already preferred in 1932, of incorporating sociology into the economics degree, the committee on lecturers and courses of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie decided in 1947 to abandon these plans and seek to develop a new sociological study course closely connected with the study of economics[54]. But the degree courses in sociology already set up had a prejudicial effect, so that thereafter new courses of study leading to the Diplom-Soziologie in which the economic theory was included as an obligatory subject.

The prevailing pattern for sociology's incorporation into tertiary education was thereby set, as a major subject course leading to a degree of its own. Examination ordinances for degree-qualified sociologists were set up by the early seventies, in addition to Frankfurt and Berlin, in Bielefeld, Hamburg, Mannheim, Marburg, Munich, Regensburg, Saarbrücken and Trier. This development seemed problematic to many from the outset. Ralf Dahrendorf expressed this unease in 1959 thus: "The signs of the times indicate that the process of professionalization in German sociology will continue to advance. The time seems to have come to give this process a word of protest along the road[55]". The problems lay in the fact that the institution of the degree-qualified sociologist outwardly expressed a measure of "professionalization" which in fact had not been reached, and on the other hand necessitated internally a fixing of sociology to particular teaching areas not supported by a consensus on the conception of sociology as a science. The process was one of the formal constitution of a scientific area via

a claim to qualification which was fully legitimated neither in professional practice nor in scientific development. This circumstance continually gave rise to sharp criticism, which in later years was directed particularly at the lack of consideration given to the occupational possibilities of degree-qualified sociologists[56].

The process can however also be seen as an innovation in the organizational conditions of German universities. In view of the long-present tendency to organize all major study courses in universities on the clder model of the state examination as specifically vocational training, sociology no doubt had no other choice as a means to secure its claim to become a major subject. The alternative, namely to set up a major subject course with an academic degree but without the vocational title would have been possible only via the Magister Artium, which would have had to have been aimed at earlier and more decisively. To be sure, from the systematic point of view such an incorporation of sociology would have been more suitable, but the Master's degree remained essentially confined to the subjects of the philosophy faculties, and was regarded as less usable for vocational ends than the diploma degrees as a conclusion to study. The situation had been defined in advance by the diploma qualifications for economists, business administrators and psychologists. Nevertheless, it would still have been possible to create a broader title of degree-qualified social scientists rather than degree-qualified sociologist and this could, with varying emphases, also have subsumed such disciplines as political science, social policy, administrative science, social education etc. The symbolic dramatization of a claim by sociology to be vocationally practical (like that of political science with the

diploma in political science) could have been avoided, the executive of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie did take this position in a resolution of 1969[57]. But this was too late to have any consequences. The diploma in sociology had already been introduced at a number of places and specified in an outline examination ordinance of the Conference of Ministers of Culture.

As Karl Mannheim had warned as long ago as 1932 "we know only too well that the initial conditions of a science mark its later structure and that in particular the form of teaching tends to be reflected in the structure of the science"[58]. The initial conditions of sociology after the war led to the development of the diploma in sociology and thereby to a special course with vocational claims. This forced upon sociology a minimum codification of areas of teaching: general or theoretical sociology, special or applied sociology, methods of empirical social research, social structure of the Federal Republic. While the fields coming under these names can be given very different contents, they do serve as a formal structure. The second component of the initial situation was the (still prevalent today) obligatory inclusion of economic theory in courses for the degree in sociology. Yet the typical thing today is the far-reaching lack of relationship between sociology and economics. The third characteristic of the initial situation can be described as the science-related rather than vocation-related orientation of the course. It is true that the Bielefeld ordinance in particular developed an emphatically vocation related trend, but more typical was a course oriented primarily towards the acquisition of theoretical concepts and the learning of empirical procedures. Significant enrichment with knowledge of

practical use in a job (e.g. social policy and social law, theory of business organization and company policy, social education and social psychology) took place only in individual cases, and even then not systematically. On the whole, the model of the diploma economist remained decisive: the rendering independent of a discipline which in teaching content is guided primarily from within the science and pursues its goal of training as a theoretical and analytical perception of problems with the necessary methods of analysis. This is based on the assumption that general educational goals open up the greatest adaptability for differing occupations, and that university training can be rendered specific, applicable and therefore usable in a job only through vocational practice. Such a strategy places a high burden of legitimation on the science for the structuring of studies - more than in study courses leading to a state examination and simply formally guaranteed through governmental career regulations giving vocational relevance.

This burden of legitimation was obvious to sociologists, even though in the fifties and sixties it was still borne lightly. At the internal working session of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie in 1961, the debate on occupational opportunities for sociologists was given much space. Any concern about vocational opportunities remained without foundation until after the sixties, since an unexpected expansion of sociology in the universities took up the mass of those who qualified, and the generally expansive labour market also opened up good occupational possibilities of the most diverse nature for the rest. Moreover, largish numbers of people who had studied sociology as their major subject began to leave the universities only in the early seventies. Mannheim's point about the repercussions of the form of teaching on the form of the science cannot be given a unitary reply for sociology of the fifties and sixties. The independence of sociology and its freeing from

interdisciplinary courses promoted its institutional separateness and the reduction in concern for economic, political, legal and cultural questions. But it was less the expansion of major subject courses than the inclusion of sociology in basic teacher training that took place only towards the end of the sixties that influenced the form of the science. It was only then that there came the vast numbers of students and the resulting burden of teaching trivialized basic knowledge, which also had repercussions on the form of the science. Sociology was still more influenced by university policy and the prevailing ideas of the late sixties and early seventies. These circumstances are not directly connected with the formation of the teaching structure in the fifties.

VI. Developments in the Sixties

The sixties were characterized first of all by considerable growth of sociology at the universities. In 1960 there were 25 full professorships, and in 1970 these already numbered 69 (see Table 3). This trebling in 10 years had not been expected by anyone round about 1960. The report of the Academic Council on University Expansion, highly considered at the time, recommended the setting up of a total of some ten new chairs; the memorandum for the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft called for a total of some 15 to 20 new chairs. The latter then seemed to be the upper limit of the possible[59]. The growth that went far beyond the ideas of the time resulted essentially from the newly founded universities where sociology was represented from the beginning with at least two chairs, and from the multiplication of chairs at particular universities such as Berlin, Bielefeld and Frankfurt. As a rule, expansion

not more than
at individual universities reached a figure of two full professorships and six lower posts. The local representation of sociology at universities was therefore highly varied, going from seminars with one professor and three junior staff members to separate faculties with 40 posts for academics in various salary grades. If one includes the teacher training colleges and combines the H4 and H3 posts, the result is an increase in professorships from 35 in 1960 to 190 in 1970, and of the whole academic staff in sociology from some 150 posts in 1960 to some 900 posts in 1970[60]. This expansion also affected other disciplines, and was therefore not a special characteristic of sociology, nor was it directed by the profession. But in view of the short period for which the systematic pursuit of the science had been at all possible again in the Federal Republic, of the low level of of curricular codification attained and the differing academic conceptions among sociologists themselves, this expansion faced the subject with particular problems. The initial work involved in setting up new chairs and courses

took a major part of the forces of the new occupants of chairs and their colleagues; from the building up of libraries via the drawing up of curricula, the development of examination regulations up to the organization of teaching, including the special requirements involved in an adequate training in the methods of empirical social research. Even the "founding decade" from 1950 to 1960 had given a generation an overload of such tasks, and now this also hit the next generation in the "expansion decade" from 1960-1970. This work of organization and installation must not be forgotten in considering the relatively limited research performance of sociology in the sixties by comparison with the growth in positions.

It was still possible to find staff for the expansion in posts through a relatively large number of Habilitations through the sixties (cf. Table 4). On average, those who took Habilitations after 1960 occupied chairs as professors after one or two years. The younger generation had extremely good career prospects by contrast with the previous "founding generation", though often also more limited experience of teaching and only slight chances for major independent work, often for years after writing the Habilitation.

The growth also changed the nature of sociology's "operating units" in the universities. The increase in student numbers, especially in places where sociology was included in the basic training for teachers, had turned sociology from a "marginal subject" in universities, with a compact student body of interested "volunteers", into a "mass subject" with a broad public of students obliged by the curriculum to attend two or three lectures. The setting up of parallel chairs and numerous middle-grade posts dissolved the local intellectual character imposed by the personalitiy of the only full professor, still tyrical in the foundation period, and promoted the constructing of reference frameworks and definitions of problems no longer directly connected with each other. Sociology developed a wide range of perspectives and theoretical conceptualizations, which replaced the relatively simple distinction into "schools" of the foundation period.

The first group of sociologists educated after the war were no longer oriented towards the intellectual currents of the twenties and thirties. They had taken their Habilitations in the main between 1957 and 1963, and occupied the newly created chairs in the first half of the sixties. They had come to sociology in the post-war years in a very individual fashion. Sociology courses, not to

speak of degrees, did not yet exist, and accordingly they mostly completed their studies in economics or philosophy, and in part received their specifically sociological training in the United States. They were part of a specific generational context created by the experiences of the war and post-war period and crystallizing through turning towards sociology as a still largely uncodified new prospect for academic thought. The research interests of these younger sociologists in the late fifties and early sixties showed particular points of concentration: industrial sociology, stratification and mobility, and social conflict[61]. These topics of concentration perhaps show an inclination of this generation to prefer problems that were in clear contrast to the main ideas of National Socialism; class formation instead of national community, legitimate conflict instead of forced integration, industrial work instead of blood-and-soil mythology. Karl Marx's sociology met with new interest, resulting, however, not in a neo-marxism but in the attempt to isolate Marx's sociology from Marxism[62]. Beside this was the broad, largely systematic reception of contemporary American sociology, linked with such names as Talcott Parsons, Robert K. Merton, Kingsley Davis and George C.Homans. This reception involved major debates on problems of role theory and functionalism, sparked off notably by contributions from Ralf Dahrendorf[63]. Nevertheless, the reception remained selective and rather eclectic. It seems unjustified to speak of an "Americanization" of sociology, if that is to mean anything more than the adoption of the more recent methods of empirical social research. American sociology was given rather a critical reception, and in work both on industrial sociology and on stratification theory its approaches were soon widened and it was conceptually superseded. Structural functionalism remained the strongest theoretical approach, but beside it

the " critical theory" was continued, particularly by Jürgen Habermas, systems theory was developed, particularly in the version of Niklas Luhmann, phenomenological views were revived by Thomas Luckmann and Joachim Matthes, and behaviour theory approaches were developed, supported by learning theory. In the mid-sixties new points of concentration were added, which special emphasis should be laid on educational and socialization research, and also election research. The years through 1967 saw sociology in the Federal Republic relatively open to various fundamental theoretical positions, reflective on methodology and in transition to improved techniques of research.

The centre of attention was initially the so-called positivism dispute, carried on notably by Jürgen Habermas and Hans Albert in the years from 1963 to 1965[64]. Its themes were those which in the late sixties were to play a major role in the student critique, still university-related: value freedom and interest control of science, self-development of theory, applicability of knowledge, the epistemological justifiability of statements and methodologically constricted approaches. Though we cannot here go into the details of this debate, a general importance for the development of sociology in the sixties can nevertheless be ascribed to it; it led to considerable sharpening and consequent clarification of the conflicting argumentation and promoted the adoption of both Popper's theory of science and of critical rationalism, as well as reviving a number of misunderstandings regarding Max Weber's principle of freedom from value judgements and the theory-practice problem. Sociology perhaps entered the debates of the student movement better armed theoretically than other sciences.

For all the theoretical disputes, it should not be overlooked that

the methodological developments of most importance for the research process took place in the sixties without great public notice. Among these were especially the modern methods of data evaluation using analysis programmes on computers, and the development of multivariate analysis and of statistical analytical procedures. Sociology in Germany paid less attention to these new research techniques than to the meta-theoretical problems, and it was not till the seventies that this backwardness in their adoption was caught up on, notably through the efforts of the Cologne sociologists[65].

In 1964, Max Weber's hundredth birthday was the occasion for choosing the topic "Max Weber and sociology today" as the theme of the Fifteenth German Sociological Congress. This fact was interesting to the extent that it throws light on the way in which Weber's sociology had in the meantime been taken up and acquired some importance for sociology in the Federal Republic. It was already pointed out that after the war older German sociology offered no points of linkage for the revival of sociology, and even in 1964 Weber's sociology still remained largely unknown. The first thing to strike one is that all main presenters of papers and many of the discussants did not come from the Federal Republic, and that the selected topics had hardly anything to do with Weber's sociology in the narrower sense. The piecemeal nature of the response to Weber, which had begun even during his lifetime and become established through the failure to assimulate "Economics and Society" and the writings on the sociology of religion from the twenties and thirties, again became apparent. Weber was treated from the standpoint of the value-judgement postulate, in his role as political writer and in his relation to capitalism. All three aspects had a relationship to contemporary culture, and to that extent met with lively agreement from the student public, to the

extent that papers and discussion contributions took up a critical stance towards Weber's positions. Since the sociological content stricto sensu scarcely came up for discussion, the sociological congress in no way acted to raise interest in Max Weber but more to spread a feeling of his irrelevance for sociology today. The systematic adoption of Weber was again postponed[66].

The politicization and moralization of academic approaches that was already becoming apparent in 1964 developed in the second half of the sixties into the so-called student movement. The end of the "Adenauer era", discomfort about the "restoration period", need for reforms, had brought into being a contemporary culture that in part used sociological terminology, but in the main consisted of a dramatization of values which remained precisely without any socio-logical anaylis of the reality of society. The NPD wave, the Vietnam war, the anti-nuclear movemnent and finally the interpretations of the Grand Coalition and the debate on the law of state of emergency as a reduction of the democratic content of the political system gave birth to a peculiar climate of radical cultural and social criticism, out of which there grew a mood of rupture which found support in Herbert Marcuse's theses on "repressive tolerance" and the end of scarcity of goods. The relationship to the reality of the Federal Republic was to be found notably in the criticism of the educational system, and this was also the area that sociology in the Federal Republic had more intensively gone into. The criticism by sociologists of the educational system was directed initially particularly against the differential chances of access to universities, extending there-after to class-specific socialization. It is characteristic that the social system of the Federal Republic at the end of the Adenauer period became problematic to sociologists essentially only through the educational system; indeed, not merely for sociologists, but for intellectuals in general[67]. To that extent, the most direct

connection between sociology and the reform movement at the end of the sixties was the critique of the education system. Apart from that, sociology can scarcely be seen as a stimulus for, far less a cause of, the student movement. Criticism of contemporary society had rendered itself independent of sociology, and in a short time was to turn against sociology itself. It did so not only vis à vis the sociology that the student movement called bourgeois and positivist, but also against the "Frankfurt school". While sociology had still been able rapidly to perceive and interpret the NPD wave, both diagnostically and prognostically[68], it was exposed to the student movement largely without preparation. This became clear at the Sixteenth Sociological Congress in April 1968. The major theme, Late Capitalism or Industrial Society, came at a time of great politicization and mobilization, following the death of the student Benno Ohnesorg, on 2 July 1967. The theme had been chosen in view of Karl Marx's 150th anniversary, and was intended to take as topic the applicability of Marx's sociology to contemporary society. For the then president of the German Association for Sociology, Theodor W. Adorno, this was also connected with the intention of stressing sociology's public function in enlighten ing the contemporary consciousness, albeit in clear detachment from the politics of the day. Thus, the invitation to the sociological congress said that sociology was taking "the part of enlightenment" for an "adult, critical public". "In it, politics becomes the theme, without it itself becoming politics". But academically conceived sociology was soon to be superseded by contemporary events.

The Frankfurt sociological congress symbolizes the end of the liberal function of sociology in criticizing contemporary society in the post-war period, which had hitherto had unifying and underlying importance for sociologists' self-image and had helped to compensate for many

weaknesses of sociological research and teaching. Sociologists had been taken unawares by left-wing criticism of society and its system. Both the student movement and, more recently, progressive intellectuals published treatises and pamphlets on rapidly changing modish themes, without any sociological fact finding or analysis of any kind being connected with them, even though they frequently used sociological, and later Marxist, terminology. Contemporary trends had effects on sociology rather than preceding from sociology.

The much-discussed "crisis of sociology" presented itself as sociology's incapacity to grasp and explain the new phenomenen of "cultural revolution". This was indeed a demonstration of the weakness in analytical power of a discipline that had become reestablished in twenty years and had available more staff and resources than at any other point in its history. With the subsequent new university legislation, there was often a splitting up of sociology into various local circles that had little in common with each other. Some strove after the dogmatic consistency that was to bring sociology back under doctrines of social philosophy. If this had occurred [69], it would have meant the end of sociology as an academic programme. For sociology's research programme consists precisely in isolating the social conditions of human co-existence from the interpretation of human existence sufficiently to allow them to be studied empirically, despite their constant moral cast and political implications.

How can the development of sociology up to 1967/68 be evaluated? This too can merely be indicated with a few remarks here, rather than discussed in detail.

1. Sociology had become a solidly institutionalized subject in the higher education system. However, considered all round, it is relatively more modest in size, no larger than such old subjects as

geography or modern philology.

2. Sociology has become professionalized, and educates only a small number of students taking it as a major subject (approx. 2% of all students). This professionalization presumably represents an extension of professional qualification of an academic type that can be imposed in the long-term, though the level of qualification must be raised significantly in order to be able to meet competition on the market.

3. Sociology has secured a solid social function in the area of empirical research, especially opinion research.

4. Sociology has provided only a small proportion of the knowlegde on which political decisions are based, and is on the whole far behind law, economics and the natural sciences in political importance. A sociologization of society's thinking about itself and of the decision-making processes that are based on that can be seen only in the usage of some terminology, and hardly at all in the content of analysis.

5. Sociology has exercised a certain influence on intellectual thought about contemporary culture, but this influence has declined either through the taking up of political positions or through a recourse to more traditional means of intellectual self-assertion that has increased in recent years.

6. In the old conflict between the trust on empirical experience of reality and normative definition of society, sociology remains in the tension natural to it between social analysis and the compulsion to give meaning, with the opposing fronts frequently operating against each other using the same names.

FOOTNOTES

1. Christian von Ferber, Die Entwicklung des Lehrköpers der deutschen Universitäten und Hochschulen 1864-1954, Göttingen 1956, p. 143 - 146, calculated for the economic and social sciences a loss of some 50% of university teachers as a consequence of the National Socialist seizure of power. See also René König, Die Situation der emigrierten deutschen Soziologen in Europa (also in R. König, Studien zur Soziologie. Thema mit Variationen, Frankfurt 1971) and Svend Riemer, Die Emigration der deutschen Soziologen nach den Vereinigten Staaten, both in: Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Vol. 11, 1959.

2. Among the propagandists and advocates of a new "German" sociology were: M.H. Boehm, H.L. Freyer, A. Günther (Innsbruck) G. Ipsen, F. Jerusalem, K.V. Müller, K.H. Pfeffer, M. Rumpf, A. Walther. They were supported by such non-sociologists as the educationist E. Krieck, the race researcher Hans Günther (Jena) and R. Höhn. It should be added that some of them had reservations against the established National Socialist regime and ultimately saw themselves disappointed in their romantic ideals by the practice of the system. Alfred von Martin's verdict in 1960 was: "with all of them, one has the feeling that they ended up with the National Socialists with only half their hearts, though ultimately, with their heads confused, in Leonhard Reinisch (ed.), Die Zeit ohne Eigenschaften, Stuttgart 1961, p. 217.

3. Many intellectuals felt at the time of the National Socialist power seizure, that they should see in the new political system also a spiritual and moral renewal, and their inner readiness to follow new values, was also widespread among some sociologists. After the General Assembly and Board Meeting of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie on 29 December, 1933, at which Ferdinand Tönnies was deposed as president and Hans Freyer installed as Führer, a member of the Society wrote to Tönnies in an endeavour to make him understand why he had agreed to these decisions: "The primary object of sociology, as I have long felt, (is) the people, to which I as a teacher and scholar myself belong; older sociology's concept of society seems to me, by comparison, to be an artificially objective, neutrally seen something or other, with which I have little more to do inside of myself. Every age is given by fate a style of its own, says Justus Möser somewhere; I have been reading him much lately, with great pleasure. The last generations, in a psychologically

natural manner, regarded their other concept of science as an absolute and therefore non-evaluative and neutral. I myself belong to an intermediate generation that has found it hard enough to get rid of that idea", Hermann Curth to Ferdinand Tönnies, 29.12.1933; the Tönnies archives, Schleswig-Holsteinische Landesbibliothek, Kiel. A student of Freyer and Gehlen Leipzig, Helmut Schelsky, then 21, wrote a document that is rich in testimony of the romantic euphoria of the times and the irrational faith in a transcendental meaning for the ethnic community: Sozialistische Lebenshaltung, Eichblatt Verlag, Leipzig 1934. In this he stresses, basing himself on Fichte, the communal action of the Volk as the "highest reality", the individual's obligation to feel for the ethnic community and the institutionally uncontrolled leadership through personal legitimation in order to bring about the "mission of the people". Structural conflicts are reinterpreted as differences in ideological convictions; legitmacy of the political system arises from the belief in the "sacred mission of the German people".

4. Reference is made here to the following writings of Hans Freyer: Gegenwartsaufgaben der deutschen Soziologie, Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft, Vol. 95, 1935; Das politische Semester, ein Vorschlag zur Universitätsreform, Jena 1933; Herrschaft und Planung, zwei Grundbegriffe der politischen Ethik, Hamburg 1933. Statements by other authors might be adduced here, but this evidence should suffice.

5. A detailed survey of publications close to sociology during National Socialism is given by Heinz Maus, Bericht über die Soziologie in Deutschland 1933 to 1945, in: Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Vol. 11, 1959. See also W.E. Mühlmann, Sociology in Germany: Shift in Alignment, in Howard Becker and Alvin Boskoff (Eds.), Modern Sociological Theory, New York 1957.

6. The Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie rapidly came under political pressure in 1933. Firstly, the Eighth Sociological Congress, planned for March in Kiel, had had to be postponed; then opposition grew against liberal officials of the society, notably F. Tönnies as president and L. v. Wiese as treasurer, and finally the membership of Jews and emigrés was attacked. A group of "völkisch" and Nationalist members threatened a counter-foundation and an open campaign against the old society. There followed the General Assembly in Berlin on 29 December 1933, at which the old society was altered.

Andreas Walther sketched out his ideas before this in a letter to Leopold von Wiese: "German sociology today needs a Führer, whose name is a symbol of the new Germany. A number of colleagues have welcomed the idea of proposing Mr. Freyer as President and Treasurer. Let us hope that at the Berlin meeting there will be no need to say why other colleagues, whom we greatly esteem academically and personally, are not a symbol of the new Germany today. Furthermore, the following rule would seem appropriate to me: the society should be so transformed that the "members" form something that is in principle different than hitherto, a broader, looser circle, a kind of "folk league" for German sociology, listening and contributing to the finances, but not taking part in the important decisions, so that we can include all existing members (provided they are in Germany, even without a declaration of "Aryan descent", and add others without a limit in number indeed endeavour to attract all those who are interested in sociology and thus be able to continue functioning" (letter of 19 December 1933 in copy in Tönnies' archives, Schleswig Holsteinische Landesbibliothek, Kiel). Walther was not among the firebrands; however, his letter is an exemplary reflection of the prevailing atmosphere.

There was then a counter demonstration in Jena on 5-7 January 1934, the "Meeting of German Sociologists", of which H.J. Stoltenberg gives a cautious description in the last volume of the Kölner Vierteljahreshefte für Soziologie, Vol. 12 (1933/34) p.424. Following the immediately preceding transformation of the DGS, however, no separate association was set up, nor were there any further meetings. Cf. also L. von Wiese, Die Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie, Persönliche Eindrücke in den ersten fünfzig Jahren (1909 bis

1959), in Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Vol. 11 (1959) esp. p. 16f.

7. Edward Y. Hartshorne had studied under Sorokin in Harvard, was quite familiar with German sociology and made efforts in many ways to further the reconstruction of the social sciences. In August 1946 he was shot on the autobahn by bandits. In 1937 he had already published a work on The German Universities and National Socialism (Cambridge, Harvard University Press).

8. Wiese's Soziologie, Geschichte und Hauptprobleme, 3rd ed. Berlin 1947, was the first introduction to appear after the war. It was a reprint of the 1933 edition. The fourth edition appeared in 1950. His System der Allgemeinen Soziologie was republished in 1955 in a third edition Both books repeated the conceptualization from the mid-twenties, and were not useful for the need for information on developments in the intervening 25 years. On Plenge cf. Bernhard Schäfers, Soziologie und Sozialismus, Organisation und Propaganda. Abhandlungen zum Lebenswerk von Johann Plenge, Stuttgart 1967.

9. Cf. Alfred Weber, Einführung in die Soziologie, Munich, 1955, esp. p. 12-47; the phrases quoted are on p.28.

10. Only Hanno Kesting and Herbert von Borch retained interests in the philosophy of history. The majority of the former Heidelbergers, instead , turned to the study of specific contemporary issues: thus Hans-Joachim Arndt, Gottfried Eisermann, Erwin Faul, Heinz Markmann, Helge Pross, Götz Roth. There was greater influence exerted by Dolf Sternberger's empirical studies of the political process, especially for the political science that was emerging. Additionally, in Heidelberg the sociological faculty in a narrower sense became represented only around 1960 with the calls to Wilhelm E. Mühlmann and Ernst Topitsch.

11. Cf. Anton Wittmann (ed), Handbuch für Sozialkunde, Berlin and Munich 1954 and 1955 (in several parts). Alfred von Martin wrote five systematic papers for this, hand book totalling more than 500 pages.

12. Thus, for instance, Munich University had in 1952 brought before the Ministry of Culture a structure plan in which the Economics Faculty called for a professorship in sociology as

a priority. The content and wording of the justification is worthy of note: "Social questions and interests are taking up a very wide space in the life and economy of the people and the state today. The study of sociology thereby becomes a basic prerequisite for every economist, student of business administration lawyer etc. It seems inconceivable and incredible that the Economics Faculty in Munich, with more than 3,000 students attending lectures, has sociology represented only through a supernumerary lecturer. This fact is all the more incomprehensible since it is in precisely this field that the name of Munich University has been carried far beyond the boundaries of Germany, by no less scholar than Max Weber" (Report on the situation of the Ludwig-Maximilian-University, Munich, 1954). Resistance came primarily from the Ministry of Finance which was primarily concerned to overcome the problems caused by the destruction of buildings during the war.

13. Cf. the 1919/20 debate between C.H. Becker, Gedanken zur Hochschulreform, Leipzig 1919; Georg von Below, Soziologie als Lehrfach, Munich and Leipzig 1920 and Ferdinand Tönnies, Hochschulreform und Soziologie, Jena 1920.

14. Cf. e.g. the report on the 1948 university reform by the study committee on university reform, printed as a manuscript; Politische Erziehung und Bildung in Deutschland, eine Bericht über die Konferenz in Waldleiningen 1949, Frankfurt 1949; Empfehlungen der Westdeutschen Rektorenkonferenz über die politische Bildung und Erziehung an den Universitäten und Hochschulen vom 6.1. 1954. And for a summary: Hans Kastendiek, Die Entwicklung der Westdeutschen Politikwissenschaft, Frankfurt 1977, esp. p. 171-184.

15. The wording of this resolution appears in : Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie, year 3, Vol. 2 (1950/51), p.263f. It was written essentialy by Helmut Schelsky, and contains passages that clearly express a rather critical attitude towards the new discipline of political science.

16. The findings were published in the two volumes Technik und Industriearbeit and Das Gesellschaftsbild des Arbeiters, Tübingen 1957.

17. On this cf. Hans Georg Schachtschabel, Die sozialwissenschaftliche Untersuchung einer deutschen Stadt, in: "Akademie der Arbeit" in der Universität Frankfurt am Main, Mitteilungen NF 3, December 1949, and Nels Anderson, Die Darmstadt Studie, ein informeller Rückblick, in: Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Sonderheft 1, Zur Soziologie der Gemeinde,

1956. Between 1952 and 1954 9 monographs appeared. Since then there has been no other comparably extensive study of a municipality.

18. Published as: Renate Mayntz, Soziale Schichtung und Sozialer Wandel in einer Industriegemeinde, Stuttgart 1958; Erich Reigrotzki, Die soziale Verflechtung in der Bundesrepublik Stuttgart 1956. It is only fairly recently that interest has revived in comprehensive population surveys as a means for analysing society as a whole, outside the thematically restricted and mostly not mutually comparable surveys of the opinion research institutes.

19. A good overview of the numerous refoundations is given by Max Horkheimer, Survey on the Social Sciences in Western Germany, Library of Congress, Reference Department European Affairs Division, Washington 1952. Apart from the institutes named, a few other establishments appeared dealing notably with the question of the integration of refugees, the central issue of the times. The preparedness to support empirical social research was relatively high, e.g. also among the trade unions, whose Economics Institute supported the major studies by Theo Pirker, Siegfried Braun, Burkart Lutz and Fro Hammelrath, Arbeiter Management, Mitbestimmung, Stuttgart and Düsseldorf 1955.

20. The relations between academic sociology and commercial opinion research have not been kept close. Only a few individuals have made the transition, like Gerhard Baumert, who however died before habilitation in 1963, Viggo Graf Blücher and Gerhard Schmidtchen, who later received chairs. Except for a few studies whose execution was handed out to opinion research institutes, academic sociology remained largely confined to small surveys on special topics. It was only with the setting up of the Zentrum für Umfragen, Methoden und Analysen in 1973 that the attempt was embarked on to provide a permanent methodological and substantive link between academic social research and opinion research.

21. Thus, for instance, the Americans' initial investments in the Darmstadt Study, like those of UNESCO with the institute in Cologne, became lost to sociology again after their expiry; the had from the beginning been insufficiently linked with the universities. But also the research capacities of the universities, like those of the exceptionally well equipped Institut

für Sozialforschung in Frankfurt, were soon absorbed by teaching needs, with rapid growth in student numbers in the sixties. The Sozialforschungsstelle Dortmund disintegrated into a number of un-coordinated individual projects. Typically, major research projects could be carried on only through the repeated establishment for limited periods of outside financed research groups, without adequate thematic concentration or long-term research planning.

22. Cf. M.R. Lepsius, Zur Forschungspolitischen Situation der Soziologie, and B. Lutz, Zur Lage der soziologischen Forschung in : M.R. Lepsius (ed) Zwischenbilanz der Soziologie, Stuttgart 1976, and: B. Lutz, Zur Lage der sozioloischen Forschung in der Bundesrepublik, in: Soziologie, Mitteilungsblatt der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Soziologie, Vol. 1. 1975.

23. René König, Soziologie, Fischer Lexikon, Frankfurt 1958, p.8 (18th ed., 404th Thou. 1979).

24. He very early published the first German "handbook" of questions of empirical social research: Das Interview, Dortmund and Zürich 1952, soon followed by a completely reworked edition in two volumes: Das Interview, 7th ed.: Cologne 1972 and Beobachtung und Experiment, 8th ed. Cologne 1972. This was followed by the Fischer-Lexikon "Soziologie" (1958), which has since gone through many editions (see note 23). The most important and most comprehensive handbook of sociology was to become the one edited by him: "Handbuch der empirischen Sozialforschung" (Vol. I, 1962; Vol. II , 1969, totalling more than 2,000 pages); this was rewritten in a new edition as a paperback series, Stuttgart 1973-1979 comprising 14 volumes (totalling more than 5,200 pages).

25. Cf. the autobiographical sketch: René König, Sketches by a Cosmopolitan German Sociologist, in: International Social Sciences Journal (UNESCO), Vol. XXV (1973), p. 55-70.

26. Zur Soziologie der zwanziger Jahre, reprinted in René König, Studien zur Soziologie, Frankfurt 1971. König's attempt to oppose to a cultural criticism that evaluated the present negatively without analysing it a sociology that studies the structure of contemporary society without ideological deductions or interpretations and exposes its trends for change to rational evaluation, finds expression already in his book Soziologie heute, Zürich 1949. Cf. also his Essays, which were published in a collective version under the title Soziologische

Orientierungen, Cologne and Berlin, 2nd ed. 1973.

27. On this cf. Martin Jay, The Dialectical Imagination, A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research 1923-1950, Boston 1973; Helmut Gumnior and Rudolf Ringguth, Max Horkheimer in Selbstzeugnissen und Bilddokumenten, Reinbeck 1973; Max Horkheimer, Kritische Theorie gestern und heute, in: Gesellschaft im Übergang, Frankfurt 1972, gives a very personal backward look from the year 1970.

28. While many studies were contract research, distinguishable in approach, execution and evaluation in hardly any way from studies by other institutes, above all the studies in industrial sociology, other work sought to continue the investigations of the authoritarian personality, even though no longer conceived with the same breadth as it had been in America; cf. Michaela von Freyhold, Autoritarismus und politische Apathie, Frankfurt 1971. Among the various studies on forms of political consciousness and attitudes, the greatest importance was attained by that of Jürgen Habermas, Ludwig von Friedeburg, Christoph Oehler and Friedrich Weltz, Student und Politik, Neuwied 1961.

29. Theodor W. Adorno, Zum gegenwärtigen Stand der Soziologie, Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Vol. 11. (1959), p. 259. The formulation American "social research" which Adorno in particular was fond of using polemicized against an empirical research practice that "is a mere pre-scientific description of what is the case and without reference to the concept whereby it is mediated is a façade, an appearance, and really not true", ibid. similarly in : Soziologie und empirische Sozialforschung, in: Soziologische Exkurse, Frankfurt 1956, and : Soziologie und empirische Forschung, Festschrift für Helmut Plessner, ed. K. Ziegler, Göttingen 1957.

30. The opposing parties in the fifties were René König and Adorno. On Adorno's pronouncements of the time see the references in footnote 29. König's pronouncements are to be found notably in: On Some Recent Developments in the Relation between Theory and Research, Transactions of the Fourth World Congress of Sociology Vol. II, p. 275-289, London 1959, and in his article on Germany in: J.S. Roucek (ed), Contemporary Sociology, p. 779-806, New York 1958. The debate of the sixties was published under the title: Der Positivismusstreit in der deutschen Soziologie, Neuwied and Berlin 1969, which also

contains Adorno's position again comprehensively in an introduction.

31. The basis is: M. Horkheimer and T. W. Adorno, Dialektik der Aufklärung, Amsterdam, 1947.

32. As evidence, two examples. In: Adorno's introductory lecture on the theme of late capitalism or industrial society, the central analytical categories are the Marxian concepts of productive forces and production relations, of use value and exchange value, without their being bound up - as Marx used to do - with a specific political structural analysis of the historical, empirical situation. Cf. Spätkapitalismus oder Industriegesellschaft? Verhandlungen des 16. Deutschen Soziologentages, ed. Theodor W Adorno, Stuttgart 1969, p. 12-26. In Horkheimer's "Lehren aus dem Faschismus" (1950), the central points of reference are the formation of the authoritarian personality and the totalitarian ideology, while structural and institutional factors are ignored. Cf. M. Horkheimer, Gesellschaft im Übergang, Frankfurt 1972. This was also the starting point of the Studien über Autorität und Familie, Paris 1936.

33. After his period as rector of the university in Frankfurt (1951-1953), Horkheimer held a visiting professorship in Chicago until retirement in 1959 and was again briefly in Frankfurt. Far more than Horkheimer, Adorno defined, both in and outside of Frankfurt, a specific cultural criticism against contemporary German society. Cf. in particular his then much read paperbacks: Prismen, Kulturkritik und Gesellschaft, Frankfurt 1955; Jargon der Eigentlichkeit, Frankfurt 1964; Eingriffe, Frankfurt 1963; Kritik, kleine Schriften zur Gesellschaft, Frankfurt 1971 and: Theorie der Halbbildung, in: Verhandlung des 14. Deutschen Soziologentages, Stuttgart 1959.

34. The choice of topics is a good reflection of the sequence of current "social problems" in the fifties: Arbeitslosigkeit und Berufsnot der Jugend, published by the Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund, Cologne 1952 (Unemployment after the Currency Reform); Wandlungen der deutschen Familie in der Gegenwart, Stuttgart 1953 (Stabilization of social relations after war and refugee experiences); Soziologie der Sexualität, Hamburg 1955 (first treatment of sexuality in post-war Germany under the stimulus of the Kinsey reports); Die skeptische Generation, Düsseldorf and Cologne 1957 (the question of youth's value-orientation in the post-war period); Die sozialen Folgen der

Automatisierung, Düsseldorf - Cologne 1957 (discussion of the first wave of automation); Erziehung und Schule, Würzburg 1957 (school reform and the changing function of education); Einsamkeit und Freiheit, Münster 1960 (beginning of the discussion on university reform). These works reflect the sequence and the understanding of problems of social structuring in the post-war period.

35. Helmut Schelsky, Auf der Suche nach Wirklichkeit, Düsseldorf - Cologne 1965 p. 8.

36. Helmut Schelsky, Ortsbestimmung der deutschen Soziologie, Düsseldorf - Cologne 1959, p. 56.

37. Arnold Gehlen and Helmut Schelsky (eds), Soziologie, ein Lehr- und Handbuch zur modernen Gesellschaftskunde, Düsseldorf - Cologne 1955 p. 9

38 Helmut Schelsky, Auf der Suche nach Wirklichkeit, Düsseldorf - Cologne 1965, p. 12.

39. Helmut Schelsky, Die Arbeit tun die anderen, Opladen 1975, p.255.

40. Ralf Dahrendorf, Die drei Soziologien zu H. Schelskys "Ortsbestimmung der deutschen Soziologie", in: Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Vol. 12 (1960), p. 120-133.

41. Cf. Otto Stammer, Zehn Jahre Institut für Politische Wissenschaft, in: Otto Stammer (ed), Politische Forschung, Cologne and Opladen 1960, p. 175 - 211, also Otto Stammer and Peter Weingart, Politische Soziologie, Munich 1972.

42. On this cf. the autobiographical note of Helmut Plessner in: Ludwig J. Pongratz (ed.), Philosophie in Selbstdarstellungen, Vol. 1, Hamburg 1975.

43. Among those involved in the studies on the position of German University teachers in three volumes published in Göttingen in 1956 were: Dietrich Goldschmidt, Alexander Busch, Christian Graf Krockow, Christian von Ferber, Peter von Oertzen, Peter von Blanckenburg. The Instiut für Sozialforschung in Frankfurt had in 1952 also begun a study on universities, involving among others: Christoph Oehler, Hans Sittenfeld, Hans Anger, Friedrich Tenbruck and Jürgen Habermas. The Germany university had in the

early fifties already become an object of empirical research, with a number of sociologists of the post-war generation giving critical treatments of the university and the contradictory aspects perceived in it. Further: Hans Anger, Probleme der deutschen Universität, Tübingen 1961 and Eduard Baumgarten, Zustand und Zukunft der deutschen Universität, Tübingen 1963 sowie Helmut Schelsky, Einsamkeit und Freiheit, Reinbek 1963.

44. Cf. Helmuth Plessner, Diesseits der Utopie, Ausgewählte Beiträge zur Kultursoziologie, Düsseldorf 1966.

45. Helmuth Plessner, Ansprache des Präsidenten der Gesellschaft, Verhandlungen des 14. Deutschen Soziologentages, Stuttgart 1959, p. 15.

46. The most important pronouncements are to be found in the following works: Theodor W. Adorno, Soziologie und empirische Sozialforschung, in: Wesen und Wirklichkeit, Festschrift für Helmuth Plessner, Göttingen 1957; idem, Contemporary German Sociology, in: Transactions of the Fourth World Congress of Sociology in Stresa, Vol. 2, London 1959; Ralf Dahrendorf, Betrachtungen zu einigen Aspekten der gegenwärtigen deutschen Soziologie, in: Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Vol. 11 (1959); idem, Die drei Soziologien, in: Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Vol. 12, (1960); René König, Die deutsche Soziologie im Jahre 1955, Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Vol. 8 (1956); idem, Germany, in: Joseph S. Roucek(ed) Contemporary Sociology, New York 1958; idem, Soziologie,Das Fischer Lexikon, Frankfurt 1958; idem, On Some Recent Developments in the Relation Between Theory and Research, in: Transactions of the Fourth World Congress of Sociology in Stresa, Vol. 2, London 1959; Wilhelm E.Mühlmann, Sociology in Germany: Shift in Alignment, in: Howard Becker and Alvin Boskoff (ed), Modern Sociological Theory in Continuity and Change, New York 1957; Helmuth Plessner, Ansprache des Präsidenten der Gesellschaft, in: Verhandlungen des 14. Deutschen Soziologentages in Berlin, Stuttgart 1959; Helmuth Schelsky, Ortsbestimmung der deutschen Soziologie, Düsseldorf 1959.

47. As examples of the link to classical theories we may mention: René König, Die Begriffe Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft bei Ferdinand Tönnies, in: Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Vol. 7 (1955); Friedrich H. Tenbruck, Die Genesis der Methodologie Max Webers, Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie,11th year(1959); René König, Vorwort zu Emile Durkheim, Die Regeln der soziologischen Methode,

Neuwied 1961 (4th edition 1974). As examples of the response to modern (American) sociology we may cite: Ralf Dahrendorf, Struktur und Funktion, Talcott Parsons und die Entwicklung der soziologischen Theorie, in: Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Vol. 7 (1955); idem; Homo Sociologicus; Versuch zur Geschichte, Bedeutung und Kritik der Kategorie der sozialen Rolle, in: Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Vol. 10 (1958); Friedrich H. Tenbruck, Zur deutschen Rezeption der Rollentheorie, in: Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Vol. 12 (1960); Emerich K. Francis, Wissenschaftliche Grundlagen soziologischen Denkens, Munich 1957.

48. Theodor Geiger could probably have been secured for a Chair in the Federal Republic, and was to present a paper at the eleventh Sociological Conference in 1952; after the war he published some books in German which were very well received, notably: Die Klassengesellschaft im Schmelztiegel, Cologne 1949, Aufgaben und Stellung der Intelligenz in der Gesellschaft, Stuttgart 1949, Ideologie und Wahrheit, Stuttgart and Vienna 1953. Cf. also Paul Trappe, Theodor Geiger in: Dirk Käsler (ed), Klassiker des soziologischen Denkens, 2nd Vol. Munich 1978 - Rudolf Heberle's classic study, Landbevölkerung und Nationalsozialismus, was not published until 1963 in the publications series of the Institute for Contemporary History, while his political sociology, which had appeared in the US in 1951, was not translated into German until 1967. - Karl Mannheim's early sociological work appeared only in 1964, in a selection by Kurt H. Wolf. Cf. also Kurt H. Wolf, Karl Mannheim, in: Dirk Käsler (ed), Klassiker des soziologischen Denkens, 2nd Vol., Munich 1978.

49. Cf. Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Vol. 14 (1962), p. 229-270.

50. For details see the indications in M. Rainer Lepsius, Denkschrift zur Lage der Soziologie und der Politischen Wissenschaft, Wiesbaden 1961.

51. Cf. Leopold von Wiese, Soziologie als Pflicht- oder Wahlfach an den reichsdeutschen Hochschulen, in: Kölner Vierteljahrshefte für Soziologie, Vol. 6 (1926/27); Hans Lorenz Stoltenberg, Soziologie als Lehrfach an deutschen Hochschulen, Karlsruhe 1926; Leopold von Wiese, Die Frankfurter Dozententagung vom Februar 1932, in: Kölner Vierteljahrshefte für Soziologie, Vol. 10 (1931/32).

52. Cf. Karl Mannheim, Die Gegenwartsaufgaben der Soziologie, Tübingen 1932.

53. Cf. Leopold von Wiese, Conference on: die Gestaltung des Unterrichts in den Sozialwissenschaften, 6-8 March 1953, in: Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie, Vol. 5 (1952/53), p.394 -397; idem, 2nd Conference on: die Gestaltung des Unterrichts in den Sozialwissenschaften, 24. October 1953, in: Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie, Vol. 6 (1953/54) p. 146.

54. Cf. the reports of the committee on lecturers' and study questions of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie in the Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie and Sozialpsychologie, Vol. 8 (1956) p. 702-705 and Vol. 9 (1957) p. 709-710. Reprinted also in: Joachim Matthes, Einführung in das Studium der Soziologie, Reinbek 1973, p. 252-257, who also gives a summary description of developments in the sociology curriculum since 1909.

55. Ralf Dahrendorf, Betrachtungen zu einigen Aspekten der gegenwärtigen deutschen Soziologie, in: Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Vol. 11 (1959), p.153.

56. On this cf. particularly Joachim Matthes, Einführung in das Studium der Soziologie, Reinbek 1973; Gregor Sieger, Das Studium der Soziologie in der Bundesrepublik, in: Soziologie, Mitteilungsblatt der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Soziologie, Book 1, 1972/73; the articles by Christoph Oehler, Joachim Hamers, Günter Endruweit in: Soziologie, Mitteilungsblatt der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Soziologie, Book 2, 1975; Friedhelm Neidhardt, Identitäts- und Vermittlungsprobleme der Soziologie, in: Zwischenbilanz der Soziologie, Verhandlungen des 17. Deutschen Soziologentages ed. by M. Rainer Lepsius, Stuttgart 1976.

57. Published in: Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Vol. 21 (1969), p. 444f. Reprinted also in Joachim Matthes, Einführung in das Studium der Soziologie, Reinbek 1973, p. 257f. Matthes sees this resolution as being a "declaration of bankruptcy of the sociologists' teaching policy to date" (p.20), a "failure" (p.22). It should however be born in mind that the outline examination ordinances of the Ministers of Culture of 1968 on the one hand hindered the incorporation of sociology studies in many subject combinations and on the other impeded development possibilities at universities that had not yet set up any diploma examination for sociologists. The resolution was thus directed both against such a cementation of the study of the sociology as a major subject and against the multiplication of diploma degrees, which was then foreseeable and has in fact since occurred, and which hinder the flexible arrangement of training in the social sciences as a whole. Admittedly, in view of the poor possibilities of success for free scientific associations

without broad support from "practice", i.e. from participants in these training courses who already had professional careers to defend, this resolution could be of only rhetorical importance, especailly in 1969-70. It should further be added that this resolution was seen in the GDR as a manifestation of disciplinary measures by the government against the socials critical intellectuals. There are of course no limits to the interpretation of motives on the basis of such explanations.

58. Karl Mannheim, Die Gegenwartsaufgaben der Soziologie, Tübingen 1932, p.33.

59. Cf. Empfehlungen des Wissenschaftsrates zum Ausbau der wissenschaftlichen Einrichtungen. Part 1: Wissenschaftliche Hochschulen, 1960; M. Rainer Lepsius, Denkschrift zur Lage der Soziologie und der Politischen Wissenschaft, Wiesbaden 1961, p. 75f.

60. For details: M. Rainer Lepsius, Die personelle Lage der Soziologie an den Hochschulen der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, in: Soziologie, Mitteilungsblatt der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Soziologie, Book 1 (1972/73).

61. It is not possible here to cite all the relevant works; almost all Habilitation theses come into this thematic area. A survey with literature references is given for stratification research by D. Glass and R. König (eds): Soziale Schichtung und soziale Mobilität, Sonderheft 5 of the Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, 1961, and for industrial sociology by M.R. Lepsius, Strukturen und Wandlungen im Industriebetrieb, Munich 1960.

62. Here we shall mention only the theses by: R. Dahrendorf, Marx in Perspektive, 1963 and H. Popitz, Der entfremdete Mensch, 1953.

63. Cf. the essays Struktur und Funktion (1955), Pfade aus Utopia (1958), Homo Sociologicus (1958)in R.Dahrendorf, Pfade aus Utopia, Munich 1967. Further, the influential books Soziale Klassen und Klassenkonflikt, Stuttgart, 1957, and Gesellschaft und Demokratie in Deutschland, Munich, 1965. An example of the response to American sociology is offered by the volume of selections by H. Hartmann (ed), Moderne amerikanische Soziologie, Stuttgart 1967.

64. The most important contributions to this controversy have been

published under the title: Der Positivismusstreit in der deutschen Soziologie, Neuwied and Berlin 1969. Further, the numerous writings of Hans Albert, notably his Traktat über kritische Vernunft, Tübingen 1962.

65. Reference should again be made here to the articles in the Handbook of Empirical Social Research, edited by René König, Vol. I, Stuttgart 1962, 2nd ed. 1967, Vol. 2 Stuttgart 1969 (see Footnote 24). Cf also the general survey by Erwin K. Scheuch, Forschungstechniken als Teil der Soziologie heute, in: M. Rainer Lepsius (ed), Zwischenbilanz der Soziologie, Verhandlungen des 17. Deutschen Soziologentages 1974, Stuttgart 1976.

66. Cf. Otto Stammer (ed), Max Weber und die Soziologie heute, Verhandlungen des 15. Deutschen Soziologentages 1964, Tübingen 1965. For the response to Weber in the Federal Republic, important factors were the efforts of Johannes Winckelmann for a new edition of Weber's works, and Reinhard Bendix's Max Weber, das Werk, German edition Munich 1964, and Eduard Baumgarten, Max Weber, Werk und Person, Tübingen 1964.

67. Purely as evidence, with no claim to adequate documentation: Ralf Dahrendorf, Bildung ist Bürgerrecht, Hamburg 1965, and Georg Picht, Die deutsche Bildungskatastrophe, Munich 1965.

68. Here, again purely as evidence: Erwin K. Scheuch and Hans D. Klingemann, Materialien zum Phänomen des Rechtsradikalismus in der Bundesrepublik 1966, Institut für Vergleichende Sozialforschung der Universität Köln, 1967.

69. This description breaks off in 1968. However, developments stabilized again after a few years. For subsequent events in the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie, which at any rate reflect developments to some extent, see: Die Verhandlungen der Internen Arbeitstagung der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Soziologie 1972 in Mannheim, in: Soziologie, Mitteilungsblatt der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Soziologie, Vol. 2. 1974, and Die Verhandlungen des 17. Deutschen Soziologentages in Kassel 1974, Stuttgart 1976. In both cases the author of this paper has sought to sketch in the opening addresses the situation at the time as it appeared to him.

ANNEX

Table 1: Professors who taught sociology at German universities 1932/33.

Aachen, TH

Meusel, Alfred, born 1896, full professor of Economic Theory and Sociology, dismissed 1933. Emigration 1946 Prof. of History, Humboldt University, Berlin, died 1960 in Berlin.

Berlin, University

Breysig, Kurt, born 1866, full professor of Social Theory, retired 1934 (at 68), no longer taught, died 1940 in Potsdam.

Cunow, Heinrich, born 1862, Associate Professor, 1933 banned from lecturing, died 1936 in Berlin.

Sombart, Werner, born 1863, Associate Profssor of Economics and Sociology, retired 1931, taught to his death in 1941, from 1935 only Economic Theory.

Thurnwald, Richard, born 1869, Associate Professor of Ethnology, Ethnic Psychology and Sociology, retired 1935 (at 66), taught Ethnology as Honorary Professor till end of war, died 1954 in Berlin.

Vierkandt, Alfred, born 1867, Prof. of sociology, retired 1944 (at 67) and banned from lecturing, died 1953 in Berlin.

Berlin, TH

Briefs, Götz, born 1889, Professor of Economic Theory and Industrial Sociology, 1934 emigrated, 1937 Prof. Georgetown University, Washington, died 1974.

Berlin, College of Economics

Eulenburg, Franz, born 1867, retired 1933 (at 66), died 1943 under arrest by Gestapo.

Berlin, German College of Politics

Boehm, Max Hildebert, born 1891, director of Institute for Border and External Studies in Berlin, 1933-1945 Prof. of Ethnic Theory and Ethnic Sociology, University of Jena, died 1968 in Lüneburg.

Neumann, Sigmund, born 1904, dismissed 1933, emigrated to London and US, 1934 Wesleyan University, died 1962.

Speier, Hans, born 1905, 1933 emigrated, Prof. New School of Social Research New York.

Bonn University

Schumpeter, Joseph A., born 1883, Full Professor Economic Science, 1932 resettled in US, Prof. at Harvard University, died 1950 in Taconic, Conn.

Braunschweig, TH

Geiger, Theodor, born 1891, Full Professor of Sociology, 1933 emigrated to Denmark, 1938 Prof. University of Aarhus, died 1952 at sea going from Canada to Denmark.

Breslau, University

Rosenstock-Hussy, Eugen, born 1888, Prof. of German Law and Legal History with a teaching contract for Sociology, 1934 emigrated to US, Prof. Dartmouth College, died 1973.

Dresden, TH

Stepun, Fedor, born 1884, Associate Professor of Sociology, 1937 compulsorily retired (at 53), lived in Germany, died 1960 in Munich.

Frankfurt University

Horkheimer Max, born 1895, Full Professor of Social Philosophy, 1933 emigrated to Paris and US, died 1975.

Kraft, Julius, born 1898, instructor in Sociology, 1933 emigrated to Holland and 1939 to US, died 1960.

Mannheim, Karl, born 1893, Full Professor of Sociology, emigrated to England, Professor at London University, died 1947 London.

Marr, Heinz, born 1876, Associate Professor of Social Politics and Sociology, taught Sociology till 1940.

Salomon-Delatour, Gottfried, born 1896, Associate Professor of Sociology, 1833 emigrated to Paris, 1941 to US, died 1954 in Frankfurt.

Sulzbach, Walter, born 1889, instructor in Sociology, 1933 emigrated to US, died 1969 in Kilchberg near Zurich.

Ziegler, Heinz-Otto, born 1903, instructor in Sociology, 1933 emigrated to Prague, died 1944 fighting in Royal Air Force.

Giessen, University

Stoltenberg, Hans Lorenz, born 1888, supernumerary Professor in Social Psychology and Sociology, taught till 1945, died 1963.

Göttingen, University

Martin, Alfred von, born 1882, Hon. Prof. of Sociology, 1933 resigned, lived in Munich, 1947-58 Professor University of Munich.

Halle, University

Hertz, Friedrich, born 1878, Professor, 1933 dismissed, emigrated to Britain.

Jahn, Georg, born 1885, Full Professor of Economics and Sociology, 1938 forced retirement (at 53), lived in Germany, died 1962.

Hamburg, University

Walther, Andreas, born 1879, Full Professor, retired 1944 (at 65), taught Sociology till 1944.

Landshut, Siegfried, born 1879, instructor, 1933 emigrated to Palestine, 1951 Full Professor at University of Hamburg, died 1968.

Heidelberg, University

Brinkmann, Carl, born 1885, Full Professor Economics, 1942 Prof. in Berlin, from 1940 taught no more Sociology, from 1947 in Tübingen, died 1954.

Bergstraesser, Arnold, born 1896, Associate Professor in Political Science and Foreign Studies, 1937 emigrated to US, Prof. of German Cultural History at American Universities, from 1954 in Freiburg, died 1964 in Freiburg.

Eckhardt, Hans von, born 1890, Full Professor of Political Science, 1933 dismissed, lived in Heidelberg, died 1957 in Heidelberg.

Mitgau, Hermann, born 1895, instructor in Social Science, 1934 Prof. at Teacher Training College in Cottbus, 1946 PH Göttingen.

von Schelting, Alexander, born 1894, 1933 instructor at Heidelberg, 1934-40 in the US, after that Switzerland, 1953 lecturer in Sociology in Zurich, died 1963 in Lausanne.

Sultan, Herbert, born 1894, instructor, 1936 dismissed, 1939 emigrated to Britain Prof. Heidelberg 1948, died Heidelberg 1954.

Weber, Alfred, born 1868, Full Professor of Economics, 1933 forced retirement (at 65), lived in Heidelberg, died in Heidelberg 1958.

Jena, University

Jerusalem, Franz Wilhelm, born 1883, Full Professor of Public Law and Sociology, taught Sociology till 1945, died 1970 in Munich.

Kiel University

Heberle, Rudolf, born 1896, instuctor in Sociology, 1938 emigrated to US, Prof. of Sociology at Lousiana State University.

Heyde, Ludwig, born 1888, Hon. Prof. of Social Politics, taught no more Sociology from 1933, died 1961 in Cologne.

Tönnies, Ferdinand, born 1855, Full Professor of Economics, 1913 retired, contracted teacher of Sociology from 1920, did not teach after 1933, died 1936 in Kiel.

Cologne, University

Gierlichs, Willy, born 1900, instructor in Sociology, 1939 official associate professorship, till 1944-1945, regularly taught Sociology.

Honigsheim, Paul, born 1885, Ass. Prof. of Sociology, Philosophy, Social Education, 1933 emigrated to Paris, 1936 Panama, 1938 US, Prof. Michigan State University, died 1963 in East Lansing, Mich.

Lips, Julius, born 1895, supernumerary Professor of Ethno-Sociology and Ethnography, dismissed 1933, emigrated to US, died in 1955 in Leipzig.

Mann, Fritz Karl, born 1885, Full Prof. of Economics and Sociology, emigrated in 1936 to US, Prof. American University, Washington.

Wiese, Leopold von, born 1876 Prof. of Economics and Sociology, taught Sociology till 1944/45, died in 1969 in Cologne.

Cologne Vocational Training Institute

Salomon, Albert, bron 1891, Prof. of Sociology, 1933 dismissed, emigrated to US, 1935 Prof. New School for Social Research, died 1966 in New York.

Leipzig University

Freyer, Hans, born 1887, Full Professor of Sociology, taught Sociology till 1944, 1955 Münster, died in Wiesbaden in 1969.

Ipsen, Gunther, born 1899, supernumerary Professor of Philosophy and Sociology, 1933 Full Professor of Philosophy, Education, Sociology in Königsberg, 1939 Vienna, 1951-61 Social Research Centre in Dortmund.

Wach, Joachim, born 1898, Associate Prof. of Science and Sociology of Religion, 1933 emigrated to US, Prof. Brown University, died 1955.

Mannheim, University of Commercial Studies

Bauer-Mengelberg, Käthe, born 1894, instructor in Economics and Sociology, at the same time also Prof. at the Vocational Training Institute in Frankfurt, 1933 emigrated US, Prof. Uppsala College.

Marburg, University

Solms, Max Graf zu, born 1893, instructor in Sociology, 1941 supernumerary Professor, taught Sociology till 1944/45, died

in Marburg 1968.

Munich TH

Weippert, Heinrich, born 1899, instructor in Social Sciences, 1938 Associate Prof. of Economics in Königsberg, 1945 Göttingen, Full Prof. Erlangen, died 1965.

Münster, University

Plenge, Johann, born 1874, Full Prof. of Economics, Hon. Prof. of Organisation Theory and Sociology, 1935 retired (at 61), did not teach again, died in Munich in 1963.

Nuremberg University of Commercial Studies

Proesler, Hans, born 1888, Full Professor of Economic and Social History, 1933 forced retirement (at 45), lived in Germany, died in Munich in 1956.

Rumpf, Max, born 1878, Full Prof. of Sociology, retired 1944, died in 1953 in Haar near Munich.

Rostock University

Weigmann, Hans, born 1897 supernumerary Professor of Economics and Sociology, 1934 tenured Associate Prof., 1936 Full Professor Berlin, after 1934 did not teach any more Sociology.

Table 2: Those who took Habilitation after 1933 and included Sociology among their teaching activities before or after 1945.

Geck, L.H. Adolph, born 1898, Habilitation in Economic and Social Sciences TH Berlin 1937, Teaching Licence withdrawn 1938, studied Theology, 1948 director of the Catholic Social Institute in Königswinter and instructor at Bonn University.

Jantke, Carl, born 1909, Habilitation Königsberg 1939, Section Head in Dortmund Social Research Centre 1949-1953, Prof. of Sociology, Akademie für Gemeinwirtschaft 1953, University Hamburg.

Mühlmann, Wilhelm E., born 1904, Habilitation in Ethnology, Berlin 1938, supernumerary Prof. of Sociology and Ethnology Mainz 1950, Full Professor Mainz 1957, Heodelberg 1960.

Müller, Karl Valentin, born 1896, Habilitation in Sociology and Population Science, Leipzig 1936, Associate Prof. of Population Science and Sociology, TH Dresden 1938, Full Prof. of Social Anthropology, Sociology and Ethnobiology, German University Prague 1941, Director of Institute for Study of the Gifted,Hanover 1946, 1955 Prof. of Sociology and Social Anthropology, College of Economic and Social Science, Nurmberg 1955, died 1963.

Pfeffer, Karl Heinz, born 1906, Habilitation in Sociology Leipzig 1934, Associate Professor and Professor of Ethnography and Geography of Britain and the Commonwealth Berlin 1940, Section Head for Foreign Studies, Bremen Committee on Economics and Hamburg Archive for World Economics, from 1951 Professor of Sociology of the Developing Countries, Münster 1962.

Sauermann, Heinz, born 1905, Habilitation in Economics and Sociology Berlin 1936, instructor in Frankfurt 1938, Full Prof. Frankfurt 1946.

Schelsky, Helmut, born 1912, Habilitation in Philosophy and Sociology Königsberg 1939, Assistant Prof. in Sociology and Political Philosophy Strassburg 1943, Full Professor in Sociology at Akademie für Gemeinwirtschaft Hamburg 1948, University of Hamburg 1953, University of Münster 1960.

Ziegenfuss, Werner, born 1904, Habilitation at Wirtschaftshochschule Berlin 1941, Full Prof. of Sociology at University of Economic and Social Science Nuremberg1951, died 1975 in Berlin.

Table 3: Chairs in Sociology at higher educational institutions, 1946-1970.

1946 -
1947 1 Speyer, Hochschule für Verwaltungswissenschaften
(Gehlen 1947-1962; Ryffel 1962-)

1948 3 Hamburg, Akademie für Gemeinwirtschaft
(Schelsky 1948-1953; Jantke 1953-1957; Dahrendorf 1958-1960; Bolte 1961-1964; Kob 1964-1966; Neidhardt 1968-1970)

		Kiel	(Mackenroth 1948-1955; Wurzbacher 1956; Trappe 1966-1969; Clausen 1970-).
1949	5	Cologne	(König 1949-1974)
		Wilhelmshaven,	Hochschule für Arbeit, Politik und Wissenschaft, in 1961 incorporated with Göttingen University. (M.E. Graf Solms 1949-)
1950	6	Frankfurt	(Horkheimer: Philosophy and Sociology 1950-1963, Habermas 1964-1971)
1951	8	Berlin	(Stammer 1951-1969; Dreitzel 1969-)
		Nuremberg,	Handelshochschule combined in 1960 with Erlangen University (Ziegenfuss 1951-1953; K.V. Müller 1955-1964; Wurzbacher 1965-)
1952	9	Göttingen	(Plessner 1952-1962; Bahrdt 1962-)
1953	12	Frankfurt II	(Adorno 1953-1969; Baier 1970-1975)
		Hamburg	(Schelsky 1953-1960; Kluth 1961-1977)
		Saarbrücken	(Goriely 1953-1963; Siebel 1965-)
1954	13	Freiburg	(Bergstraesser: Political Science and Sociology 1954-1964; Popitz: Sociology 1964-)
1955	14	Berlin II	(Lieber 1955-1971)
1956			
1957	18	Frankfurt III	(Kraft 1957-1960; Rüegg 1961-1973)
		Hamburg II	(Jantke 1957-)
		Mainz	(Mühlmann: Sociology and Ethnology 1957-1960; Schoeck 1965-)
		Mannheim	(Baumgarten 1957-1963; Lepsius 1963-)
1958	19	Munich	(Francis 1958-1974)
1959	21	Hanover	(Bahrdt 1959-1962; v. Ferber 1962-1970
		Nuremberg II	Handelshochschule combined in 1960 with Erlangen University (Specht 1959-)
1960	25	Heidelberg	(Mühlmann: Sociology and Ethnology 1960-1970)
		Marburg	(Maus 1960-1978)
		Münster	(Schelsky 1960-1970)
		Tübingen	(Dahrendorf 1960-1966; Tenbruck 1967-)
1961	-		

1962	31	Aachen	(*Gehlen* 1962 – 1969; *Helle* 1969 – 1972)
		Berlin III	(*v. Friedeburg* 1962 – 1966, *Claessens* 1966 –)
		Bonn	(*Eisermann* 1962 –)
		Heidelberg II	(*Topitsch* 1962 – 1969)
		Karlsruhe	(*Linde* 1962 –)
		Münster II	(*Claessens* 1962 – 1966; *Matthes* 1967 –1969)
1963	36	Bochum	(*Papalekas* 1963 –)
		Frankfurt IV	(*Tenbruck* 1963 – 1966; *Zapf* 1968 – 1972)
		Hamburg III	(*Tartler* 1963; *Kob* 1966 –)
		Mannheim II	(*Albert* 1963 –)
		Saarbrücken II	(*Rassem* 1963 – 1968; *Helfer* 1969 –)
1964	40	TU Berlin	(*Klages* 1964 – 1973)
		Köln II	(*Scheuch* 1964 –)
		München II	(*Bolte* 1964 –)
		Münster III	(*Hartmann* 1964 –)
1965	45	Berlin IV	(*Behrendt* 1965 – 1972)
		Berlin V	(*Mayntz* 1965 – 1971)
		Frankfurt V	(*Luckmann* 1965 – 1970)
		Giessen	(*Pross* 1965 – 1976)
		Mainz II	(*Jonas* 1965 – 1968; *Landwehrmann* 1971 –)
1966	49	Bochum II	(*Jaeggi* 1966 – 1972)
		Frankfurt VI	(*v. Friedeburg* 1966 – 1969)
		Konstanz	(*Dahrendorf* 1966 – 1970)
		Marburg II	(*Hofmann* 1966 – 1969; *Tjaden* 1970 – 1974)
1967	52	Bochum III	(*Kesting* 1967 – 1975)
		Darmstadt	(*Teschner* 1967 –)
		Regensburg	(*Daheim* 1967 –)
1968	56	TU Berlin II	(*Mackensen* 1968 –)
		Bielefeld	(*Kaufmann* 1968 –)
		Erlangen	(*Mangold* 1968 –)
		Stuttgart	(*Vente* 1968 – 1978)
1969	59	Bielefeld II	(*Matthes* 1969 – 1977)
		Bielefeld III	(*Ludz* 1969 – 1973)
		Bielefeld IV	(*Storbeck* 1969 –)
1970	69	Augsburg	(*Reimann* 1970 –)
		Bielefeld V	(*Schelsky* 1970 – 1973)
		Bielefeld VI	(*Luhmann* 1970 –)
		Bielefeld VII	(*v. Ferber* 1970 – 1977)
		Bielefeld VIII	(*Harder* 1970 –)
		Konstanz II	(*Luckmann* 1970 –)
		Regensburg II	(*Sack* 1970 – 1974)
		Trier	(*Heinemann* 1970 –)
		Tübingen II	(*Neidhardt* 1970 – 1974)
		Würzburg	(*Hartfiel* 1970 – 1973)

Table 4: Habilitations in Sociology, 1946 - 1970

1946	–	
1947	–	
1948	–	
1949	2	*Reigrotzki* (Marburg), *Stammer*, (Berlin)
1950	1	*Lieber* (Berlin)
1951	–	
1952	3	*Munke* (Berlin), *Specht* (Köln), *Wurzbacher* (Hamburg)
1953	1	*Heintz* (Köln)
1954	–	
1955	1	*Scharmann* (Marburg)
1956	3	*Kluth* (Hamburg), *Papalekas* (Münster), *Rassem* (Munchen)
1957	7	*Albert* (Köln), *Bolte* (Kiel), *Dahrendorf* (Saarbrucken), *Eisermann* (Heidelberg), *Mayntz* (Berlin), *v. Oppen* (Hamburg), *Popitz* (Freiburg)
1958	2	*Bahrdt* (Mainz), *Hofmann* (Wilhelmshaven)
1959	1	*Blankenburg* (Göttingen)
1960	4	*Anger* (Mannheim), *Claessens* (Berlin), *v. Friedeburg* (Frankfurt), *Oberndörfer* (Freiburg)
1961	7	*v. Ferber* (Göttingen), *Habermas* (Marburg), *Klages* (Erlangen), *Linde* (Münster), *Scheuch* (Köln), *Tartler* (Münster), *Tenbruck* (Freiburg)
1962	3	*Fürstenberg* (Erlangen), *Hartmann* (Münster), *Irle* (Mannheim)
1963	5	*Kob* (Münster), *Lepsius* (München), *Planck* (Hohenheim), *Pross* (Frankfurt), *Wössner* (Erlangen)
1964	3	*Jonas* (Münster), *Matthes* (Münster), *Siebel* (Münster)
1965	3	*Ambros* (Nürnberg), *Peisert* (Tübingen), *Steger* (Münster)
1966	10	*Daheim*, (Köln), *Emge* (Bonn), *Grohs* (Berlin), *Helfer* (Göttingen), *Kesting* (Aachen), *Kurucz* (Saarbrücken), *Luhmann* (Münster), *Reimann* (Heidelberg), *Savramis* (Köln), *Vetter* (Mannheim)
1967	9	*Buchholz* (Hohenheim), *Clausen* (Münster), *Helle* (Hamburg), *Krysmanski* (Münster), *Ludz* (Berlin) *Mackensen* (Münster), *Storbeck* (Münster), *Thomas* (Göttingen), *Zapf* (Konstanz)
1968	9	*S. Braun* (Göttingen), *Dreitzel* (Göttingen), *Hartfiel* (Berlin), *Heinemann* (Karlsruhe), *Kaufmann* (Münster), *Krauch* (Heidelberg), *Landwehrmann* (Bochum), *Neidhardt* (München), *Schmidt-Relenberg* (Hamburg)
1969	6	*Baier* (Münster), *Hetzler* (Berlin), *Hondrich* (Köln), *Knebel* (Münster), *Lenk* (Berlin), *Tjaden* (Marburg)
1970	7	*Eberlein* (Berlin), *Holm* (Berlin), *Holzer* (München), *Lepenies* (Berlin), *Opp* (Nürnberg), *Sack* (Köln), *Schäfers* (Münster)

Years	Number of Habilitations	Average birth year of those taking Habilitation
– 1955	8	1911
1956 – 1960	17	1923
1961 – 1965	21	1926
1966 – 1970	41	1930

Table 5: Executive members of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie

1946 Inaugural meeting in Bad Godesberg
Leopold von Wiese, President
Christian Eckert
Georg Jahn
Max Graf Solms
Hans Lorenz Stoltenberg
Heinz Sauermann (additionally elected at the General Assembly in Frankfurt)

1948 Resolution: the Executive to remain in office till further notice, with no new elections.

1952 Following the death of Christian Eckert, Karl Gustav Specht becomes Provisional Treasurer.

1953 General Assembly in Cologne (number of members raised to nine)
Leopold von Wiese, President
Georg Jahn
Charlotte Lütkens
Alexander Rüstow
Heinz Sauermann
Helmut Schelsky
Max Graf Solms
Karl Gustav Specht, Treasurer
Hans Lorenz Stoltenberg

1955 General Assembly in Göttingen
Helmuth Plessner, President
Arnold Bergstraesser
Marx Horkheimer
René König
Charlotte Lütkens
Wilhelm E. Mühlmann
Alexander Rüstow
Heinz Sauermann, Treasurer
Helmut Schelsky

1957 General Assembly in Göttingen
Helmuth Plessner, President
Arnold Bergstraesser
René König
Charlotte Lütkens
ElisabethPfeil
Heinrich Popitz
Heinz Sauermann, Treasurer
Helmut Schelsky
Otto Stammer

1959 General Assembly in Berlin
Otto Stammer, President
Hans Achinger, Treasurer
Hans Paul Bahrdt
Helmut Becker
Ralf Dahrendorf
Charlotte Lütkens
Elisabeth Pfeil
Helmuth Plessner
Heinrich Popitz

1961 General Assembly in Tübingen
Otto Stammer, President
Hans Achinger, Treasurer
Theodor W. Adorno
Helmut Becker
Ralf Dahrendorf
Ludwig von Friedeburg
René König
Heinrich Popitz
Helmut Schelsky

1963 General Assembly in Frankfurt
Theodor W. Adorno, President
Karl Martin Bolte, Treasurer
Christian von Ferber
Ludwig von Friedeburg
Jürgen Habermas
René König
Heinz Kluth
Renate Mayntz
Gerhard Wurzbacher

1965 General Assembly in Frankfurt
Theodor W. Adorno, President
Karl Martin Bolte, Treasurer
Ludwig von Friedeburg
Heinz Kluth
M. Rainer Lepsius
Renate Mayntz
Helge Pross
Erwin K. Scheuch

1967 General Assembly in Frankfurt
Ralf Dahrendorf, President
Egon Becker
Karl Martin Bolte, Treasurer
Dieter Claessens
Heinz Kluth
M. Rainer Lepsius
Werner Mangold
Erwin K. Scheuch
Wolfgang Zapf

Table 6: the German Sociological Congresses and their major themes

8th German Sociological Congress, Frankfurt, 19-21 September 1946.

L. v. Wiese:	The present situation from a sociological viewpoint.
M. Graf Solms:	Theory of association
H. Sauermann:	Social stratification
J. v. Kempski:	Natural Law and international law
J. Schiefer:	The sociology of the German trade unions

9th German Sociological Congress, Worms, 9-12 August 1948

TH. Litt:	German Youth today
Howard Becker:	Youth work and the Youth Movement today and previously.
B. Kautsky:	Terror
E. Kogon:	Terror
Howard Becker:	The development of sociological research outside Germany

Roundtable discussion on the "Scienitificization of Politics" introduced by K. Sting.

10th German Sociological Congress, Detmold, 17 October 1950

F. Stepun:	The homeland and outsiders
H. Schelsky:	Refugee Families
C.A. Emge:	Bureaucratization
A. Gehlen:	Co-reporter

11th German Sociological Congress, Weinheim a.d.B. 23-25 September 1952.

J. Johannesson:	Choice of occupation
F. Bülow:	Co-reporter
M.M. Kossitsch:	Cells and Cliques
O.H. v.d. Gablentz:	Co-reporter

Roundtable discussion: The contemporary state and economic and extra economic interest groups, introduced by H. Herrfahrdt.

12th German Sociological Congress, Heidelberg, 15-17 October 1954
(in connection with the 3rd Anthropological-Sociological Conference)

Th. W. Adorno:	On the problem of ideology
A. Hauser:	Co-reporter
J.v. Kempski:	The liberal professions
R.J. Humm:	Co-reporter
A. Portmann:	
A. Sänger	
Th. Scharmann:	
W. Laiblin:	The child (contributions from the view-points of various disciplins)
C. Bennholdt - Thomsen:	
J.P. Ruppert:	
K. Lücken	
W.E. Mühlmann:	
R.v. Ungern-Sternberg:	
C. Gorman:	

13th German Sociological Congress Bad Meinberg, 2-3 November 1956.
"Tradition, Restoration and Revolution"

A. Bergstraesser:	Forms of tradition
C. Jantke:	Industrial society and tradition
R. Nürnberger:	Revolution and tradition
S. Landshut:	Tradition and Revolution
A. Mitscherlich:	Puberty and Tradition
P.R. Hofstätter:	American and German loneliness

14th German Sociological Congress, Berlin, 20-24 May 1959
"Sociology and Modern Society"

M. Horkheimer:	Sociology and philosophy

H. Achinger:	Sociology and social reform
R. König:	Changes in the position of the sociological intelligentsia
O. Stammer:	The position of Berlin as a sociological and political problem
Symposium:	Germany's contribution to sociology from the international viewpoint. Participants: H. Becker, R.F. Beerling, M. Ginsberg.

Meetings of special committees on industrial sociology, sociology of religion, sociology of schooling and education, ethno-sociology.

Internal work session of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie, Tübingen, 19-21 October 1961.

K.R. Popper:	The logic of the social sciences
Th. W. Adorno:	On the logic of the social sciences
S. Groenmann:	Vocational opportunities for sociologists
R. König	Vocational opportunities for sociologists

15th German Sociological Congress Heidelberg, 28-30 April 1964.

"Max Weber and Sociology Today"

E. Topitsch:	Max Weber and sociology today
T. Parsons:	Value freedom and objectivity
R. Aron:	Max Weber and power politics
H. Marcuse:	Industrialization and capitalism

Meetings of the special committees on sociology of religion, organizational sociology, methodological questions, sociology of schooling and education, family and youth issues, ethno-sociology.

16th German Sociological Congress, Frankfurt, 8-11 April 1968
"Late Capitalism or Industrial Society?"

Th. W. Adorno:	Introductory address
K. Borchardt:	On the theory of the socio-economic development of contemporary society.
A.R.L. Gurland:	Co-reporter
J. Bergmann, G. Brandt, K. Körber, E.Th. Mohl, C. Offe:	Rule, class relationships and stratification
R. Dahrendorf:	Co-reporter

J. Taubes:	Culture and ideology
E.K. Scheuch:	Methodological problems of analysis of society as a whole
M.R. Lepsius:	Democracy in Germany as a historical and sociological problem.
J. v. Kempski:	Problems of formalization in sociology
B. Lutz:	Production processes and professional qualification
N. Luhmann:	Modern system theories as a form of analysis of society as a whole.
D. Claessens:	Role theory as bourgeois mystificatory ideology in education.
Th. Pirker:	Theories of social change exemplified in the developing countries.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE

EUI WORKING PAPERS :

No. 1 :	Jacques PELKMANS	The European Community and the Newly Industrialized Countries
No. 2 :	Joseph H.H. WEILER	Supranationalism Revisited - Retrospective and Prospective. The European Communities After Thirty Years
No. 3 :	Aldo RUSTICHINI	Seasonality in Eurodollar Interest Rates
No. 4 :	Mauro CAPPELLETTI/ David GOLAY	Judicial Review, Transnational and Federal: Impact on Integration
No. 5 :	Leonard GLESKE	The European Monetary System: Present Situation and Future Prospects
No. 6 :	Manfred HINZ	Massenkult und Todessymbolik in der nazional-sozialistischen Architektur
No. 7 :	Wilhelm BURKLIN	The "Greens" and the "New Politics": Goodbye to the Three-Party System?
No. 8 :	Athanasios MOULAKIS	Unilateralism or the Shadow of Confusion
No. 9 :	Manfred E. STREIT	Information Processing in Futures Markets. An Essay on the Adequacy of an Abstraction
No. 10:	Kumaraswamy VELUPILLAI	When Workers Save and Invest: Some Kaldorian Dynamics
No. 11:	Kumaraswamy VELUPILLAI	A Neo-Cambridge Model of Income Distribution and Unemployment
No. 12:	Kumaraswamy VELUPILLAI Guglielmo CHIODI	On Lindahl's Theory of Distribution
No. 13:	Gunther TEUBNER	Reflexive Rationalität des Rechts
No. 14:	Gunther TEUBNER	Substantive and Reflexive Elements in Modern Law
No. 15:	Jens ALBER	Some Causes and Consequences of Social Security Expenditure Development in Western Europe, 1949-1977
No. 16:	Ian BUDGE	Democratic Party Government: Formation and Functioning in Twenty-one Countries

No. 17:	Hans DAALDER	Parties and Political Mobilization: An Initial Mapping
No. 18:	Giuseppe DI PALMA	Party Government and Democratic Reproducibility: The Dilemma of New Democracies
No. 19:	Richard S. KATZ	Party Government: A Rationalistic Conception
No. 20:	Jürg STEINER	Decision Process and Policy Outcome: An Attempt to Conceptualize the Problem at the Cross-National Level
No. 21:	Jens ALBER	The Emergence of Welfare Classes in West Germany: Theoretical Perspectives and Empirical Evidence
No. 22:	Don PATINKIN	Paul A. Samuelson and Monetary Theory
No. 23:	Marcello DE CECCO	Inflation and Structural Change in the Euro-Dollar Market
No. 24:	Marcello DE CECCO	The Vicious/Virtuous Circle Debate in the '20s and the '70s
No. 25:	Manfred E. STREIT	Modelling, Managing and Monitoring Futures Trading: Frontiers of Analytical Inquiry
No. 26:	Domenico Mario NUTI	Economic Crisis in Eastern Europe - Prospects and Repercussions
No. 27:	Terence C. DAINTITH	Legal Analysis of Economic Policy
No. 28:	Francis C. CASTLES/ Peter MAIR	Left-Right Political Scales: Some Expert Judgements
No. 29:	Karl HOHMANN	The Ability of German Political Parties to Resolve the Given Problems: the Situation in 1982
No. 30:	Max KAASE	The Concept of Political Culture: Its Meaning for Comparative Political Research
No. 31:	Klaus TOEPFER	Possibilities and Limitations of a Regional Economic Development Policy in the Federal Republic of Germany
No. 32:	Ronald INGLEHART	The Changing Structure of Political Cleavages Among West European Elites and Publics
No. 33:	Moshe LISSAK	Boundaries and Institutional Linkages Between Elites: Some Illustrations from Civil-Military Elites in Israel
No. 34:	Jean-Paul FITOUSSI	Modern Macroeconomic Theory An Overview

No. 35:	Richard M. GOODWIN/ Kumaraswamy VELUPILLAI	Economic Systems and their Regulation
No. 36:	Maria MAGUIRE	The Growth of Income Maintenance Expenditure in Ireland, 1951-1979
No. 37:	G. Lowell FIELD John Higley	The States of National Elites and the Stability of Political Institutions in 81 Nations, 1950-1982
No. 38:	Dietrich HERZOG	New Protest Elites in the Political System of West Berlin: The Eclipse of Consensus?
No. 39:	Edward O. LAUMANN David KNOKE	A Framework for Concatenated Event Analysis
No. 40:	Gwen MOORE/ Richard D. ALBA	Class and Prestige Origins in the American Elite
No. 41:	Peter MAIR	Issue-Dimensions and Party Strategies in the Irish Republic, 1948 - 1981: The Evidence of Manifestos
No. 42:	Joseph H.H. WEILER	Israel and the Creation of a Palestine State. The Art of the Impossible and the Possible
No. 43:	Franz Urban PAPPI	Boundary Specification and Structural Models of Elite Systems: Social Circles Revisited
No. 44:	Thomas GAWRON Ralf ROGOWSKI	Zur Implementation von Gerichtsurteilen Hypothesen zu den Wirkungsbedingungen von Entscheidungen des Bundesverfassungsgerichts
No. 45:	Alexis PAULY René DIEDERICH	Migrant Workers and Civil Liberties
No. 46:	Alessandra VENTURINI	Is the Bargaining Theory Still an Effective Framework of Analysis for Strike Patterns in Europe?
No. 47:	Richard A. GOODWIN	Schumpeter: The Man I Knew
No. 48:	J.P. FITOUSSI/ Daniel SZPIRO	Politique de l'Emploi et Réduction de la Durée du Travail
No. 49:	Bruno DE WITTE	Retour à Costa. La Primauté du Droit Communautaire à la Lumière du Droit International

No. 50:	Massimo A. BENEDETTELLI	Eguaglianza e Libera Circolazione dei Lavoratori: Principio di Eguaglianza e Divieti di Discriminazione nella Giurisprudenza Comunitaria in Materia di Diritti di Mobilità Territoriale e Professionale dei Lavoratori
No. 51:	Gunther TEUBNER	Corporate Responsibility as a Problem of Company Constitution
No. 52:	Erich SCHANZE	Potentials and Limits of Economic Analysis: The Constitution of the Firm
No. 53:	Maurizio COTTA	Career and Recruitment Patterns of Italian Legislators. A Contribution to the Understanding of a Polarized Political System
No. 54:	Mattei DOGAN	How to Become a Cabinet Minister in Italy: Unwritten Rules of the Political Game
No. 55:	Mariano BAENA DEL ALCAZAR/ Narciso PIZARRO	The Structure of the Spanish Power Elite 1939-1979
No. 56:	Berc RUSTEM/ Kumaraswamy VELUPILLAI	Preferences in Policy Optimization and Optimal Economic Policy
No. 57:	Giorgio FREDDI	Bureaucratic Rationalities and the Prospect for Party Government
No. 58:	Manfred E. STREIT	Reassessing Consumer Safety Regulations
No. 59:	Christopher HILL/ James MAYALL	The Sanctions Problem: International and European Perspectives
No. 60:	Jean-Paul FITOUSSI	Adjusting to Competitive Depression. The Case of the Reduction in Working Time
No. 61:	Philippe LEFORT	Idéologie et Morale Bourgeoise de la Famille dans le Ménagier de Paris et le Second Libro de Famiglia, de L.B. Alberti
No. 62:	Peter BROCKMEIER	Die Dichter und das Kritisieren
No. 63:	Hans-Martin PAWLOWSKI	Law and Social Conflict
No. 64:	Marcello DE CECCO	Italian Monetary Policy in the 1980s
No. 65:	Giampaolo ROSSINI	Intraindustry Trade in Two Areas: Some Aspects of Trade Within and Outside a Custom Union
No. 66:	Wolfgang GEBAUER	Euromarkets and Monetary Control: The Deutschemark Case

No. 67:	Gerd WEINRICH	On the Theory of Effective Demand under Stochastic Rationing
No. 68:	Saul ESTRIN/ Derek C. JONES	The Effects of Worker Participation upon Productivity in French Producer Cooperatives
No. 69:	Berc RUSTEM/ Kumaraswamy VELUPILLAI	On the Formalization of Political Preferences: A Contribution to the Frischian Scheme
No. 70:	Werner MAIHOFER	Politique et Morale
No. 71:	Samuel COHN	Five Centuries of Dying in Siena: Comparisons with Southern France
No. 72:	Wolfgang GEBAUER	Inflation and Interest: the Fisher Theorem Revisited
No. 73:	Patrick NERHOT	Rationalism and the Modern State
No. 74:	Philippe C. SCHMITTER	Democratic Theory and Neo-Corporatist Practice
No. 75:	Sheila A. CHAPMAN	Eastern Hard Currency Debt 1970-83. An Overview
No. 76:	Richard GRIFFITHS	Economic Reconstruction Policy in the Netherlands and its International Consequences, May 1945 - March 1951
No. 77:	Scott NEWTON	The 1949 Sterling Crisis and British Policy towards European Integration
No. 78:	Giorgio FODOR	Why did Europe need a Marshall Plan in 1947?
No. 79:	Philippe MIOCHE	The Origins of the Monnet Plan: How a Transistory Experiment answered to Deep-Rooted Needs
No. 80:	Werner ABELSHAUSER	The Economic Policy of Ludwig Erhard
No. 81:	Helge PHARO	The Domestic and International Implications of Norwegian Reconstruction
No. 82:	Heiner R. ADAMSEN	Investitionspolitik in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1949-1951
No. 83:	Jean BOUVIER	Le Plan Monnet et l'Economie Française 1947-1952
No. 84:	Mariuccia SALVATI	Industrial and Economic Policy in the Italian Reconstruction

No. 85: William DIEBOLD	Trade and Payments in Western Europe in Historical Perspective: A Personal View by an Interested Party
No. 86: Frances LYNCH	French Reconstruction in a European Context
No. 87: Gunther TEUBNER	Verrechtlichung Begriffe, Merkmale, Grenzen, Auswege
No. 88: Marina SPINEDI	Les Crimes Internationaux de l'Etat dans les Travaux de Codification de la Responsabilité des Etats Entrepris par les Nations Unies
No. 89: Jelle VISSER	Dimensions of Union Growth in Postwar Western Europe
No. 90: Will BARTLETT	Unemployment, Migration and Industrialization in Yugoslavia, 1958-1977
No. 91: Wolfgang GEBAUER	Kondratieff's Long Waves
No. 92: Elisabeth DE GHELLINCK, Paul A. GEROSKI Alexis JACQUEMIN	Inter-Industry and Inter-Temporal Variations in the Effect of Trade on Industry Performance
No. 93: Gunther TEUBNER Helmut WILLKE	Kontext und Autonomie, Gesellschaftliche Selbststeuerung durch reflexives Recht
No. 94: Wolfgang STREECK, Philippe C. SCHMITTER	Community, Market, State- and Associations?
No. 95: Nigel GRIFFIN	"Virtue Versus Letters": The Society of Jesus 1550-1580 and the Export of an Idea
No. 96: Andreas KUNZ	Arbeitsbeziehungen und Arbeitskonflikte im öffentlichen Sektor Deutschland und Großbritannien im Vergleich 1914-1924
No. 97: Wolfgang STREECK	Neo-Corporatist Industrial Relations and the Economic Crisis in West Germany
No. 98: Simon A. HORNER	The Isle of Man and the Channel Islands - A Study of their Status under Constitutional International and European Law
No. 99: Daniel ROCHE	Le Monde des Ombres
No. 100: Gunther TEUBNER	After Legal Instrumentalism?
No. 101: Patrick NERHOT	Contribution aux Débats sur le Droit Subjectif et le Droit Objectif comme Sources du Droit

84/102: Jelle VISSER — The Position of Central Confederations in the National Union Movements

84/103: Marcello DE CECCO — The International Debt Problem in the Inter-War Period

84/104: M. Rainer LEPSIUS — Sociology in Germany and Austria 1918-1945. The Emigration of the Social Sciences and its Consequences. The Development of Sociology in Germany after the Second World War, 1945-1967

84/105: Derek JONES — The Economic Performances of Producer Cooperations within Command Economies: Evidence for the Case of Poland

84/106: Philippe C. SCHMITTER — New-Corporatism and the State

84/107: Marcos BUSER — Der Einfluß der Wirtschaftsverbände auf Gesetzgebungsprozesse und das Vollzugswesen im Bereich des Umweltschutzes